

Duquesne University Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Spring 2016

Unlikely Partners: Collaboration Between Colonizationists and Radical Abolitionists in Washington County, Pennsylvania, during the 1830s

Joseph Andrew Smydo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Smydo, J. (2016). Unlikely Partners: Collaboration Between Colonizationists and Radical Abolitionists in Washington County, Pennsylvania, during the 1830s (Master's thesis, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/1221>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillipsjg@duq.edu.

UNLIKELY PARTNERS:
COLLABORATION BETWEEN COLONIZATIONISTS AND RADICAL
ABOLITIONISTS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, DURING THE
1830S

A Thesis

Submitted to the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

By

Joe Smydo

May 2016

Copyright by

Joe Smydo

2016

UNLIKELY PARTNERS:
COLLABORATION BETWEEN COLONIZATIONISTS AND RADICAL
ABOLITIONISTS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, DURING THE
1830S

By

Joe Smydo

Approved February 19, 2016

Perry K. Blatz, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of History
(Thesis Director)

Michael Cahall, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of History
(Thesis Reader)

James Swindal, Ph.D.
Dean, McAnulty College and Graduate
School of Liberal Arts

John J. Dwyer, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of History
Associate Professor of History
(Committee Member)

ABSTRACT

UNLIKELY PARTNERS: COLLABORATION BETWEEN COLONIZATIONISTS AND RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, DURING THE 1830S

By

Joe Smydo

May 2016

Thesis supervised by Perry K. Blatz, Ph.D.

In the scholarly literature, colonizationists and radical abolitionists are portrayed as composing perpetually warring camps. While that may have been true at the state and national levels of the movements, the evidence suggests that the relationship between the groups was much more fluid at the grassroots. In Washington County, Pennsylvania, colonizationists and radical abolitionists cooperated on various community-development initiatives during the 1830s. Slavery was important to these community elites. But other issues were just as important to them, if not more.

TO JUDY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer thanks the Washington County Historical Society and the U. Grant Miller Library at Washington and Jefferson College for providing access to archival materials.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
List of Tables	viii
Chapter 1: Colonization, Radical Abolitionism and Washington County, Pennsylvania....	1
Chapter 2: Immediatism and Colonization in Historical Perspective.....	18
Chapter 3: The History of Slavery in Washington County.....	42
Chapter 4: The Resuscitation of Washington College.....	51
Chapter 5: The Founding of Washington Female Seminary.....	61
Chapter 6: Cooperation in Business and Banking.....	70
Conclusion: Slavery and the Hierarchy of Community Values.....	82
Work Cited.....	119

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Colonizationists and Radical Abolitionists in Washington County.....	103
Table 2: Radical Abolitionists, Colonizationists and Washington College.....	107
Table 3: Immediatists, Colonizationists and Washington Female Seminary.....	115
Table 4: Investors in the Franklin Bank of Washington.....	118

Chapter 1: Colonization, Radical Abolitionism and Washington County, Pennsylvania

During the 1830s, especially from 1833 to 1838, mobs repeatedly attacked abolitionists and anti-slavery gatherings in the Northern and Midwestern United States. Historian Leonard L. Richards asserted that the mobs often included prominent citizens—“gentlemen of property and standing”—who were members of the American Colonization Society. Richards ascribed colonizationist participation in mob violence to the advent of radical abolitionism, a strain of anti-slavery that included harsh criticism of the Colonization Society and challenged the leadership status of community elites. Among many other incidents, Richards said, mobs spurred by colonizationists broke up the inaugural meeting of the New York City Anti-Slavery Society in October 1833; attacked an anti-slavery convention in Utica, New York, in October 1835; destroyed an anti-slavery newspaper and pillaged a black neighborhood in Cincinnati, Ohio, in July 1836; and murdered the anti-slavery newspaper publisher Elijah Lovejoy in Alton, Illinois, in November 1837. Richards observed, “Almost automatically, as anti-slavery organizers invaded one community after another, zealous colonizationists became alarmed. Time and again, they aroused their townsmen to violence and sought their enemy in battle.”¹

Radical abolitionism, espoused by the American Anti-Slavery Society and its state and local auxiliaries, demanded immediate steps toward the “entire abolition of slavery in the United States.” Radical abolitionists, or immediatists, rejected the notion of compensating planters for freed slaves. They also opposed proposals to expel freedmen from America, believing that blacks had earned the right to citizenship and a stake in the nation’s future. Unlike gradual abolitionists, who had been present since the nation’s founding and worked patiently for an emancipation that

¹ Leonard L. Richards, *Gentlemen of Property and Standing: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), 5, 14, 22-30, 61-62, 91-92, 98-100, 102, 109-110.

they hoped one day would come, radical abolitionists attempted to hasten the institution's demise.² The American Colonization Society, which had its own network of state and local affiliates, had a diverse membership with diverse aims. Members favored gradual emancipation—if they favored emancipation at all—and supported the deportation of free blacks and ex-slaves to colonies in Liberia. Colonizationists insisted that the black and white races could not peacefully co-exist in America. Many colonizationists considered their work a benevolent exercise, but radical abolitionists, such as the vituperative William Lloyd Garrison, considered colonization little more than a racist scheme to rid America of its free black population and fasten the chains more firmly on those still in bondage.³

The impression conveyed by contemporary writers—and reinforced by the historians who followed—is that colonizationists and radical abolitionists composed perpetually warring camps.⁴ Yet that was not the case. The evidence suggests that relationships between the groups were much more fluid, at least on the local level. In Washington County, Pennsylvania, for example, colonizationists and radical abolitionists collaborated on important community-building initiatives during the 1830s. They worked together to resuscitate a shuttered college,

² American Anti-Slavery Society, *The Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society: With the Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention at Philadelphia, December 1833, and the Address to the Public, Issued by the Executive Committee of the Society, in September 1835* (New York: American Anti-Slavery Society, 1838), 3, 5, 8, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/constitutionofam00amer#page/n1/mode/2up> (accessed June 8, 2013); Beverly C. Tomek, *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), xv; Ronald G. Walters, *American Reformers, 1815-1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978).

³ American Colonization Society, *A Few Facts Respecting the American Colonization Society and the Colony at Liberia* (Washington: D.C.: Way and Gideon, 1830), 3, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/fewfactsrespecti01amer#page/n5/mode/2up> (accessed June 9, 2013); Passage from *The Liberator*, April 23, 1831, quoted in William Lloyd Garrison, *Thoughts on African Colonization: Or an Impartial Exhibition of the Doctrines, Principles and Purposes of the American Colonization Society, together with the Resolutions, Addresses and Remonstrances of the Free People of Color* (Boston: Garrison and Knapp, 1832), 10, Google Books, http://books.google.com/books/about/Thoughts_on_African_Colonization.html?id=nKFrO-yBjEC (accessed June 8, 2013).

⁴ Garrison, for example, described his conflict with colonizationists as “warfare.” *Thoughts on African Colonization*, 3.

open a female seminary, establish a bank, battle cholera and promote temperance. It is important to appreciate the magnitude of collaboration involved in these ventures, undertaken almost simultaneously by a relatively small group of white men. The participants worked closely together for years at a stretch and, in many cases, they invested not only their time but their money in the endeavors. Moreover, colonizationists and radical abolitionists cooperated on these enterprises while passionately championing their respective positions on the slavery question.

The county's colonizationists and radical abolitionists had overwhelming incentive to cooperate. The interests uniting them dwarfed the issues that divided them. The colonizationists and radical abolitionists included some of the county's early settlers and leading citizens, men inextricably linked by family, business and civic ties forged over many years. Before, during and after the 1830s, these men and their families held positions of leadership in the county, built the civic institutions that sustained their society, helped each other in time of need and cooperated on business ventures intended to enrich their kinship networks.⁵ Collaboration during the period of radical abolitionism was enlightened self-interest and "business as usual" for men who had a vested interest in seeing Washington County and its seat, the town of Washington, prosper. Slavery was important to these community elites. But other issues were just as important to them, if not more.⁶

The lives of Alexander Reed and Francis Julius LeMoyne⁷ offer a window on the pragmatic nature of the colonizationist-radical abolitionist relationship in Washington County. An eighteen-year-old Reed arrived in Washington from County Donegal, Ireland, in 1794. It was

⁵ Washington County is in southwestern Pennsylvania. As discussed below, the record of colonizationist-radical abolitionist cooperation is established by newspaper accounts, by the participants' correspondence and by government and institutional records. This thesis primarily addresses cooperation around Washington College, Washington Female Seminary and the Franklin Bank of Washington.

⁶ The county's known colonizationists and radical abolitionists are identified in Table 1.

⁷ LeMoyne hereafter will be referred to by his last name or as F.J. LeMoyne.

the year of the Whiskey Rebellion, the frontier backlash against the federal government's excise tax on whiskey, and Reed found himself among an isolated, clannish and self-reliant people. The hard-headed, irascible minister's son fit right in. Reed was part of the county's growing Scotch-Irish population. Shortly after arriving in Washington, he took over a store established by a brother who had preceded him to town and died. Reed also pursued farming, real-estate speculation and investment in local infrastructure. Involvement in civic matters complemented his business interests. When the town was incorporated in 1810, Reed served as its first burgess. He advocated for the town's public schools and served as the longtime treasurer of Washington's First Presbyterian Church. He was among the first, if not the first, to import the Merino sheep that would figure prominently in the county's agricultural economy. At Reed's funeral in 1842, the Reverend Matthew Brown devoted much of his eulogy to Reed's civic-mindedness, saying, "In whatever concerned the community at home; in all meetings for consultation; in all projects and enterprises to advance the interests of town or country; in all the institutions for promoting the cause of education, morals or religion, or for financial purposes, he was prominent, active and efficient." He was an influential citizen and a friend, Brown said, "of the farmer, the mechanic and every class of the community. The farmers in Washington County are indebted to him, more than to any other man, for their increased wealth and prosperity."⁸

Reed also owned at least one slave. Enacted in the 1780s, Pennsylvania's gradual-emancipation laws required Pennsylvania residents to register their slaves and to free, at the age of twenty-eight, those born after March 1, 1780. Reed was one of at least 146 county residents

⁸ Alexander Preston Reed, *Alexander Reed (1776-1842) and His Descendants* (Pittsburgh: Reed & Witting Co., 1960), 9-10; Matthew Brown, *A Discourse Delivered at the Funeral of Alexander Reed, Esq., Washington, Pennsylvania, September 11, 1842* (Pittsburgh: A. Jaynes, 1842), 13-14, 18; Thomas P. Slaughter, *The Whiskey Rebellion: Frontier Epilogue to the American Revolution* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 3-4, 29-31. While the family history asserts that Alexander Reed took over a business founded by his brother, Brown's eulogy maintains that the enterprise was started by a friend.

who registered 639 slaves between 1782 and 1820. He registered “Harry,” then four-and-a-half months old, in May 1806. According to a transcript of the county slave register, Harry was the child of “Betty,” a so-called “slave for life” because she was born before 1780 and not among those covered by the gradual-emancipation laws. It is unclear whether Reed owned Betty as well her offspring. Harry would have turned twenty-eight and earned his freedom in 1834, when radical abolitionism arrived in Washington County. The Washington County Colonization Society stepped up its own activities that year, with Reed elected one of the group’s vice presidents.⁹

The LeMoynes, too, were early immigrants to Washington County. LeMoyne’s father, John Julius LeMoyne, was a royalist who fled the French Revolution. He arrived in Washington in 1796, two years after Alexander Reed, and went into business as a tavern owner, druggist and doctor. F.J. LeMoyne, born in 1798, also became a doctor. A thriving practice enabled the younger LeMoyne to purchase real estate, experiment with wool growing and other forms of agriculture and, eventually, donate money for Washington’s first town hall and library. F.J. LeMoyne was in many ways like Reed—civic-minded, influential and wealthy. But he was steadfastly opposed to slavery.¹⁰

While a student at Washington College, F.J. LeMoyne had participated in literary society debates about slavery, and he expressed opposition to bondage as early as his senior year in

⁹ Brown, 12, 15; Reed, 82; Transcript of *Negro (Slave) Register of Washington County, Pennsylvania, from 1782 to 1851*, Archives of Washington and Jefferson College, hereafter W&J Archives, File xv-j-238; “Public Meeting,” *Washington Examiner*, Washington, PA, June 7, 1834; Paul Finkelman, “The Kidnapping of John Davis and the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793,” *Journal of Southern History* 56, no. 3 (August 1990), 400-401, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2210284> (accessed October 8, 2013). Alexander Reed eventually may have acquired ownership in two other slaves, “Henry Roberts” and “Charles,” through his second wife, Isabella Hoge Reed. In addition, his will bequeathed sixty dollars and two suits to “our colored boy, Jacob ... at the expiration of his term of service.” The slave register does not mention Jacob.

¹⁰ Margaret C. McCulloch, *Fearless Advocate of the Right: The Life of Francis Julius LeMoyne, M.D., 1798-1879* (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1941), 13-15, 37, 88, 179, 221-222.

1815. Biographer Margaret C. McCulloch said, “Once convinced, no opposition could shake him, and once clear that the cause of right in any issue demanded his personal support, he would throw the whole weight of his personality into the struggle and go through with it at any cost.”¹¹ The Washington County Anti-Slavery Society was organized in 1834, and LeMoyne was elected the group’s president the following year. He also was the first president of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, established in 1837, and the same year he was designated an “agent,” or speaker, for the American Anti-Slavery Society.¹² LeMoyne corresponded with the foremost anti-slavery figures of his day and operated a stop on the Underground Railroad. After some radical abolitionists in 1840 established the Liberty Party as a political vehicle for their cause, LeMoyne declined the party’s nomination for vice president of the United States but three times accepted nomination for governor of Pennsylvania and once accepted nomination for Congress. He lost all four campaigns. LeMoyne’s correspondence is extensive, and his archives account for much of what is known about radical abolitionism in Washington County.¹³

Although the Reeds and LeMoynes had sharply different views on slavery, the families’ ties were resilient and intergenerational. Reed’s store at Main and Wheeling streets was just a few blocks from the Maiden Street homes owned by John Julius and F.J. LeMoyne. When the

¹¹ McCulloch, 28-29, 31, 112-114, 135, 145. McCulloch said LeMoyne embraced radical abolitionism in 1834, after reading the constitution of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society. While LeMoyne did indeed become active in the movement that year, the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society did not then exist.

¹² “First Anniversary of the Washington Anti-Slavery Society,” *Our Country*, Washington, PA, July 30, 1835; Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Convention, Assembled to Organize a State Anti-Slavery Society, at Harrisburg, on the 31st of January and 1st, 2d and 3d of February 1837* (Philadelphia: Merrihew and Gunn, 1837), hereafter PASS convention, 61-62, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/proceedingsopen00penn#page/n5/mode/2up> (accessed June 13, 2013); Letter from James G. Birney to F.J. LeMoyne, December, 11, 1837, hereafter Birney letter, Archives of Washington County Historical Society, hereafter WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 3; LeMoyne’s certificate of agency from the American Anti-Slavery Society, December 12, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 13.

¹³ McCulloch, 129, 134, 139, 145. The Birney letter is one example of LeMoyne’s correspondence with national anti-slavery leaders. Documentation of LeMoyne’s involvement in the Underground Railroad includes a letter to him and fellow abolitionist Joseph Templeton from Thomas Lee, May 8, 1847, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 1B.

younger LeMoyne was at medical school in Philadelphia in 1823, his father experienced severe financial problems. Alexander Reed helped to stave off the creditors, a kindness that F.J.

LeMoyne likely appreciated and remembered no matter how heated the debate over slavery became in the 1830s. The families must have been very close for Reed to have stepped in as he did. F.J. LeMoyne later mentored Alexander's son, Robert R. Reed, in medicine. Robert Reed went on to become a prominent physician—and, in the 1830s, an ardent colonizationist.¹⁴

The Reed and LeMoyne families were tied not only to each other but to the town and county. Alexander Reed served as a trustee of Washington College and its predecessor, Washington Academy. Generations of his descendants became graduates and trustees of the college. LeMoyne was a Washington College graduate and trustee whose family members became alumni and trustees of the institution. In addition, the Washington Female Seminary educated and employed young women linked to the Reed and LeMoyne families through blood, marriage and social networks. During and after the 1830s, F.J. LeMoyne, Alexander Reed and Reed's sons, Robert and Colin, served alongside each other on initiatives advancing the college and seminary, helping to guide the institutions that supported their families and the town.¹⁵ The slavery question did not separate these clans, which maintained a close association for

¹⁴ Reed, 77; McCulloch, 54-55, 71; "Public Meeting," June 7, 1834; "Dr. Francis Julius LeMoyne," *Daily Evening Reporter*, Washington, PA, October 15, 1879; Washington and Jefferson College, *Biographical and Historical Catalogue of Washington and Jefferson College, Containing a General Catalogue of Washington College, of Jefferson College, and of Washington and Jefferson College, Including Thus All the Alumni of the Present College: 1802-1889*, hereafter W&J, *Catalogue* (Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Co., 1889), 283, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/biographicaland00eatogoog#page/n290/mode/2up> (accessed September 3, 2013).

¹⁵ Tables 2 and 3, which show the ties that colonizationists and radical abolitionists had with graduates of Washington College and Washington Female Seminary; Reed, 10; W&J, *Catalogue*, 266-267, 389-390; "Trustees," in *Semi-Centennial Celebration of Washington Female Seminary, 1836-1886, Washington, Penna., June 8, 1886, and General Catalogue of the Alumnae* (Philadelphia: Thomson and Brother, 1886), 50; Alfred Creigh, *History of Washington County from Its First Settlement to the Present Time* (Harrisburg: B. Singerly, 1871), 199; "Reed Family to Assemble for Reunion Next Weekend," clipping from unidentified newspaper, May 12, 1962; "Mrs. A.C. Beeson," undated death notice clipping from unidentified newspaper. The two newspaper clippings, which document Reed family ties to the college and seminary, were found tucked into a copy of *Alexander Reed and His Descendants* at the WCHS Archives.

generations. Alexander Reed's grandson, George Washington Reed, married Matilda McKennan, a daughter of colonizationist Thomas McKean Thompson McKennan, in 1861. They had twelve children, including a son they named Francis LeMoyne Reed. Matilda McKennan Reed died in 1900, and in 1907, George Washington Reed remarried. His second wife was Madeleine LeMoyne, the youngest of F.J. LeMoyne's eight children. Madeleine died in October 1943. Six years later, Alexander Reed's great-granddaughter, Janet Fitch, named her daughter Madeleine LeMoyne Fitch.¹⁶

This is not to suggest that the relationship between the county's immediatists and colonizationists always was smooth. It is possible that some members of the groups disliked each other intensely as they vied for the hearts of fellow citizens—for the hearts of entire towns and villages, even—on the slavery question. External forces likely made collaboration a more complicated proposition. As affiliates of state and national organizations, the county colonization and anti-slavery societies faced pressure to raise money, recruit members and spread their respective messages. Fiery itinerant abolitionists, who may have been unaware of or indifferent to local immediatist-colonizationist alliances on other issues, posed a destabilizing dynamic to the relationship. Yet the groups' collaboration survived local debate, outside agitation and outbursts of violence.¹⁷

¹⁶ McKennan hereafter will be referred to by his last name or as T.M.T. McKennan. Reed, 46, 47, 50, 61; "City's 'First Lady' Taken by Death: Mrs. Reed Was Long Active, Had Lived More Than 100 Years," *Washington Reporter*, Washington, PA, October 27, 1943. To this day, Alexander Reed's descendants are prominent Washington residents.

¹⁷ Samuel Gould, an agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society whose travels in Washington County are described below, certainly was a destabilizing influence on the relationship between local colonizationists and radical abolitionists. Among other examples of external pressure, the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1836 directed its auxiliaries to distribute copies of the society's constitution, to circulate petitions for ending the slave trade in Washington, D.C., to explore the possibility of teaching trades or skills to free blacks and to report on the auxiliaries' use of speakers and printed materials. American Anti-Slavery Society, *Third Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society; with the Speeches Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting, Held in the City of New York, on the 10th May 1836, and the Minutes of the Meetings of the Society for Business* (New York: William S. Dorr, 1836), 26-27, Google Books, books.google.com/books?id=NMLfAAAAMAAJ (accessed March 31, 2014).

An itinerant speaker carried the spark of radical abolitionism to Washington County. In May 1834, Milton Sutliff, a Philadelphia-based agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, appeared at the Washington County Courthouse to propose the creation of a local auxiliary. When he offered to debate the merits of immediatism, supporters of colonization accepted the challenge. In what may have been his first public stand for radical abolitionism, F.J. LeMoyne assisted Sutliff and James Loughhead, then an agent of the Pittsburgh Anti-Slavery Society, in presenting their case. A group of Washington College professors made the argument for colonization. After listening to seventeen to twenty hours of debate over three days, a crowd voted overwhelmingly to endorse colonization and to resuscitate a county Colonization Society that had gone moribund since its founding some years before. In June 1834, Representative T.M.T. McKennan was elected president of the reorganized Colonization Society, and Alexander Reed and Robert R. Reed were elected two of the group's five vice presidents. Despite the general public support for colonization, supporters of radical abolitionism did not retreat into the background. By July 4, 1834, they established their own organization, the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society, with Joseph Henderson, a former county sheriff and state legislator, as president. Although Leonard Richards said tumult followed radical abolitionist organizing in other places, there is no indication that formation of the anti-slavery society created any lasting discord in the community or that Sutliff or Loughhead was mistreated while visiting Washington.¹⁸

¹⁸ It is not known how many people attended the debate or how many attended only as partisans, but the radical abolitionists unsuccessfully tried to exclude from voting anyone who already had belonged to an anti-slavery or colonization society. Richards, 30; "Public Meeting," June 7, 1834; "Colonization and Abolition," *Washington Examiner*, May 24, 1834; Creigh, 254, 258; John L. Myers, "The Early Antislavery Agency System in Pennsylvania, 1833-1837," *Pennsylvania History* 31, no. 1 (January 1965), 66, <http://jstor.org/stable/27770233> (accessed November 13, 2013).

In October 1834, Loughhead and LeMoyne agitated for immediatism in another Washington County town, West Middletown. Thomas McCall, a former state legislator from the county, argued the colonizationists' case during a debate in the Methodist church there. At one point, according to a newspaper account, McCall "urged the colonization scheme as far preferable to that of the abolitionists; still maintaining that he would rejoice to see the two societies acting in concert and aiding each other." The crowd—its size was not reported—voted to establish an anti-slavery society. McCall's conciliatory tone—so different from the contemporary and scholarly depictions of colonizationist-radical abolitionist interaction—is telling. While the county's colonizationists and radical abolitionists had ample incentive to cooperate during the 1830s, a commitment to civil discourse may have helped them to keep collaborations on track.¹⁹

Similarly, the conduct of itinerant speakers may have determined how they were treated on visits to Washington County. Like Loughhead and Sutliff, Theodore Dwight Weld, the American Anti-Slavery Society's foremost agent, was politely received in Washington. In advance of Weld's June 8, 1835, address in Washington's Methodist Episcopal Church, a newspaper invited residents to turn out so they could "hear and judge for themselves." Something about the message, or about Weld, must have resonated with the townsfolk because he still was addressing "crowded and attentive audiences" days later. The local newspaper *Our Country* said, "However much individuals may differ with him as to the most advisable method of abolishing slavery, we believe that all, without exception, agree in opinion that he fully maintains the character of a man of talent, a gentleman and a Christian." In all, Weld remained about two weeks. *Our Country* said, "Although it might be supposed that our citizens would

¹⁹ "Anti-Slavery Meeting," *Washington Examiner*, November 8, 1834; Creigh, 253.

become wearied with such a prolonged series of discourses as Mr. Weld has been delivering, yet so far from such by the fact additional interest appears to be excited by each successive slavery lecture.” Weld’s magnetism may have generated concern among Alexander Reed and other Colonization Society members, who held what *Our Country* described as an “irregular” meeting on June 16. Washington County’s colonizationists challenged Weld to a debate. He accepted the proposal, but there is no record of a debate having occurred.²⁰

Elliott Cresson, a leader of the Young Men’s Colonization Society of Pennsylvania, likewise received a peaceable reception. While visiting at least three Washington churches over a two-week period in May 1836, Cresson collected enough money to “secure the liberation and settlement in Africa of several slaves” and promoted the society’s Liberian settlement at Bassa Cove.²¹ But Samuel Gould, an American Anti-Slavery Society agent, provoked a far different reaction on his June 1836 visit to the county. He spoke twenty-three times in eleven towns—and established eight auxiliaries of the society—but at a price. In an account published in *The Friend of Man*, Gould said, “Our cause has triumphed nobly, though here, as elsewhere, I have had to contend with ferocious opposition.” The worst occurred June 21 in Washington, where a crowd lobbed eggs and rocks through the windows of Cumberland Presbyterian Church as Gould spoke. According to Gould, members of the audience “remained quiet and undisturbed, amidst volleys of missiles, which were ruining clothes and endangering lives; determined that it should not be

²⁰ Theodore Dwight Weld’s notable place in the anti-slavery movement is further explained on pp. 21-22. “Notice,” *Our Country*, June 5, 1835, “Mr. Weld,” *Our Country*, June 12, 1835; “Mr. Weld” and “The Colonization Society,” *Our Country*, June 18, 1835; Myers, 69.

²¹ “African Colonization,” *Washington Examiner*, May 21, 1836; “Colonization Proceedings,” *Washington Examiner*, May 28, 1836.

said that a MOB had driven *them* from their chosen place of assembling.” Gould left the church under guard, and the mob chased him to F.J. LeMoynes’s home a few blocks away.²²

The authorities charged five citizens with the attack on Gould. It is unclear whether they were colonizationists. The community’s reaction to the violence was mixed, with some citizens blaming the immediatists for fomenting unrest. The county Colonization Society decried the violence. Alexander Reed sponsored—and the Colonization Society membership adopted—the following resolution: “That however widely we differ in opinion with the advocates of immediate abolition, we cannot permit the occasion to pass without expressing our strong abhorrence of every attempt to arrest their proceedings by mobs, or the violation of the laws of our land . . . We deprecate any forcible suppression of their doctrines, however wild or extravagant.”²³

The radical abolitionists received far less sympathy June 24 at a special town meeting held to address the turmoil. Some citizens assailed the abolitionists’ “offensive doctrines” and demanded an end to their activism. The immediatists’ critics included John Griffith, the chief burgess; Judge Thomas H. Baird, a colonizationist; and Thomas McGiffin, who was Baird’s partner in various business ventures and a colonizationist. On June 27, however, residents of West Middletown, including the colonizationist Thomas McCall and radical abolitionists Thomas McKeever and Daniel McGugin, held their own meeting to protest the violence in Washington and the criticism that Griffith, Baird, McGiffin and others had heaped upon the

²² Emphasis in quotation in the original. Myers, 73; Letter from Samuel Gould, printed in *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, Baltimore, Maryland, and reprinted in *The Friend of Man*, Utica, New York, August 4, 1836, Cornell University, <http://fom.library.cornell.edu> (accessed September 9, 2013).

²³ Pleading in Washington County Court, reprinted in American Anti-Slavery Society, *Fourth Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society, with the Speeches Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting Held in the City of New York, on the 9th of May 1837, and the Minutes of the Meetings of the Society for Business* (New York: William S. Dorr, 1837), 87, Samuel J. May Anti-Slavery Collection at Cornell University, <http://ebooks.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=mayantislaavery;idno=02817510> (accessed September 12, 2013); “Colonization Meeting,” *Washington Examiner*, June 25, 1836.

immediatists. The West Middletown gathering applauded the resolution that Alexander Reed had sponsored at the Colonization Society meeting, saying it reflected “the sentiments of every true philanthropist.” In the wake of the attack on Gould, did Reed and McCall try to patch things up with their radical abolitionist neighbors because of the need to continue working with them on other civic initiatives? At the very least, it appears that Gould’s visit produced a split in the colonization camp, with Baird and McGiffin disagreeing with Reed and McCall on how to respond to the day’s events.²⁴

Leonard Richards asserted that colonizationists sometimes participated directly in mob action against radical abolitionists and other times goaded local ruffians into committing the violence. It is unclear which, if either, scenario played out in the attack on Samuel Gould, although Margaret McCulloch described Washington as divided into four camps: radical abolitionists, colonizationists, pro-slavery sympathizers and a rabble happy to capitalize on slavery-related tension. The size and makeup of the mob that attacked Gould are not known. In his letter published in *The Friend of Man*, Gould said the mob was influenced by leading citizens—he even used the term “gentlemen of property and standing”—but he did not identify any of the agitators by name or assert that any were colonizationists. Nor did LeMoyne, in his own account published in *The Friend of Man*, criticize any rioter or instigator by name or

²⁴ “Town Meeting” and “At a Meeting of the Citizens of the Borough of West Middletown,” *Our Country*, June 30, 1836; “Town Meeting,” *Washington Examiner*, June 25, 1836; Letter from Joseph Mills to F.J. LeMoyne, August 2, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 3; Pennsylvania Colonization Society, Appendix to *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll at the Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, October 25, 1838* (Philadelphia: William Stavely, 1838), 47, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/addressofjosephr00inge> (accessed March 6, 2014); “The Pennsylvania Union Convention,” *Niles’ Weekly Register*, May 13, 1837, reprinted in *Niles’ Weekly Register, Containing Political, Historical, Geographical, Scientifical, Statistical, Economical, and Biographical Documents, Essays and Facts: Together with Notices of the Arts and Manufactures and a Record of the Events of the Times*, ed. William Ogden Niles, 52 (Baltimore: William Ogden Niles, 1837), 167, Google Books, books.google.com/books?id=zKM-AQAAMAAJ; Boyd Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” in *History of Washington County, Pennsylvania, with Biographical Sketches of Many of Its Pioneers and Prominent Men*, ed. Boyd Crumrine (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts and Co., 1882), 547-548, Internet Archive, <http://digital.library.pitt.edu/cgi-bin/t/text/text-idx?idno=00hc17099m;view=toc;c=pitttext> (accessed November 18, 2013).

identify any as a Colonization Society member. Perhaps restraint was a concession LeMoyne made to colonizationists who were his associates in other civic ventures. LeMoyne certainly recognized the risk of colonizationist-led violence; in an April 1837 letter to fellow immediatist Joseph Templeton, LeMoyne said, “The principal and most virulent opposition we meet is from colonisators. Tis true there is much apathy in the public mind about the present and eternal welfare of colored men; but this does not mob and slander as the other cause does.” Was he talking about being mobbed himself? Or was he referring to violence against radical abolitionists in other locales? His correspondence is not specific. But he went on to say that radical abolitionists were prepared to meet any future challenge from colonizationists, “whether it comes in the shape of personal or political violence—by *mob* or law—by wholesale or retail ...”²⁵

The men charged in the assault on Gould—James Ruple Jr., H.W. Sample, James Orr Willson, Joseph Dillow and William Sloan—never faced a jury. Charges were dropped when the five admitted wrongdoing, apologized for their behavior and agreed to pay for damages to the church. As county historian Earle Forrest put it, “Dr. LeMoyne had several of those engaged in the attack arrested, but the matter was finally fixed up.”²⁶ Ruple was the son of Colonel James Ruple, a veteran of the War of 1812 who served as a county coroner and clerk of courts and as a town burgess. He also was a builder who participated in business and civic ventures with immediatists and colonizationists. James Jr. held factory and court-related jobs in Virginia from about 1832 to spring 1836, at which point he returned to Washington and took work in the post office. By summer 1836, he had changed jobs again and was working as a carpenter. He was

²⁵ Emphasis in quotation in the original. Richards, 149-150; McCulloch, 116-117; Letter from Samuel Gould reprinted in *The Friend of Man*, August 4, 1836; Letter from F.J. LeMoyne to *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, reprinted in *The Friend of Man*, August 4, 1836, Cornell University, <http://fom.library.cornell.edu> (accessed September 9, 2013); Letter from F. J. LeMoyne to Joseph Templeton, April 6, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 13.

²⁶ Pleading in Washington County Court, reprinted in American Anti-Slavery Society, *Fourth Annual Report*; Earle R. Forrest, *History of Washington County* (Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1926), 1:420.

twenty-four at the time of the riot.²⁷ Information about the other four defendants is scarce. James Orr Wilson appears to have been the grandson of James Orr, who served as a town burgess and councilman and as a First Presbyterian Church elder. Colonization Society records listed a “J. Willson” as a member in 1838, but it is not known whether this is the same person involved in the attack on Gould. H.W. Sample appears to have been the grandson of pioneer settler Hugh Workman and a relative of William Sample, owner of the *Washington Reporter*. William Sample and his brother-in-law, Samuel Workman, were members of the county Colonization Society in the 1820s, if not afterward. While the court record shows he eventually apologized for his part in the violence, H.W. Sample was not contrite in the immediate aftermath of the incident. During a Fourth of July celebration two weeks after Gould’s visit, Sample made a tongue-in-cheek toast to “the agents of the abolition societies, firebrands, thrown into a peaceable community, may they reap the just rewards of their labor.” Ironically, the holiday event took place on the farm of radical abolitionist Samuel McFarland.²⁸

Gould was not yet done making a stir. He appeared at LeMoyne’s house on the Fourth of July—evidently before the revelry at McFarland’s farm—to mark the anti-slavery society’s second anniversary. Though threats had been made against the participants, the meeting went off without incident. LeMoyne recalled, “We have had a very large and very interesting anniversary,

²⁷ As noted below, the elder Ruple joined radical abolitionists and colonizationists in founding the Franklin Bank of Washington in 1836. J.H. Beers & Co., *Commemorative Biographical Record of Washington County, Pennsylvania, Containing Biographical Sketches of Prominent and Representative Citizens, and Many of the Early Settled Families* (Chicago: J.H. Beers & Co., 1893), 1:19-21; Creigh, 132.

²⁸ Creigh, 132-133; Presbytery of Washington, PA, *History of the Presbytery of Washington, Including a Brief Account of the Planting of the Presbyterian Church in Western Pennsylvania and Parts Adjacent, with Sketches of the Pioneer Ministers and Ruling Elders: Also Sketches of Later Ministers and Ruling Elders* (Philadelphia: James B. Rodgers Printing Co., 1889), 228, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/historyofpresbyt00pres> (accessed April 5, 2014); Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 484; American Colonization Society, “The Tenth Annual Report of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Color of the United States: With an Appendix,” hereafter “Tenth Annual Report,” in American Colonization Society, *Annual Report of the American Colonization Society, Vols. 6-10* (n.p., n.d), 96, Google Books, books.google.com/books?id=FMgCAAAAYAAJ (accessed April 6, 2014); “4th of July,” *Washington Examiner*, July 9, 1836.

and much good will come of it.”²⁹ In mid-July, Gould appeared in another county town, Williamsport, to give additional addresses. The townsfolk, fearing a riot, implored Gould to leave. He nonetheless lectured at the Methodist Episcopal Church, where a mob gathered and then dispersed without incident. The mob later coalesced at the house where Gould was staying and expressed its displeasure by throwing eggs and blowing horns. Gould left a couple of days later, with the town still in an uproar. A constable was said to have arrested some of the rioters, but their names and the details of the cases against them do not seem to have survived. Newspaper owner John Grayson, a colonizationist, called Gould “a very impudent man, if not in a great degree regardless of the public peace, which has in so many places been violated through his own immediate instrumentality.”³⁰

In March 1837, several months after his harrowing experiences, Gould wrote to LeMoyne. “I am anxious to know how the state of things in Washington County is in relation to our good cause,” he said. “Has the opposition increased its bitterness? Do our friends flinch before it? Is the cause on the whole advancing before you?” It is not known how, or whether, LeMoyne responded. But the local situation was more complicated than Gould might have appreciated. For while the colonizationists and radical abolitionists continued to compete in one arena, they kept working together on other matters for their own benefit and that of the town and county. They seem to have had little difficulty, or wasted little time, putting the unpleasantness of Gould’s visit behind them.³¹

²⁹ The source of the threats is not known. Letter from F.J. LeMoyne reprinted in *The Friend of Man*, August 4, 1836; “First Anniversary of Washington County Anti-Slavery Society” [incorrect headline as this was the society’s second annual gathering], *Washington Examiner*, July 9, 1836; “First Anniversary of the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society” [another incorrect headline], *Our Country*, July 7, 1836.

³⁰ “Public Meeting,” June 7, 1834; “Meeting in Williamsport,” *Washington Examiner*, August 6, 1836; John Grayson, “The Commotion at Williamsport,” *Washington Examiner*, August 6, 1836.

³¹ James Ruple evidently suffered no long-term consequences for participating in the mob violence against Samuel Gould. If anything, his fortunes improved. He married into one of the county’s oldest families and had seven children. From 1839 to 1845, he served as a clerk at a state office in Harrisburg. After that, he joined John Grayson’s

son in ownership of the *Washington Examiner* and at various times held the posts of deputy sheriff, county prothonotary and federal revenue agent. He became prominent in the Masons and rose to the rank of general in the local militia. A history of important Washington County residents, published in 1893, described Ruple as a “much honored” citizen known for “wearing his well-earned laurels with dignified modesty.” Letter from Samuel Gould to F.J. LeMoyne, March 11, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 3; Beers, 1:19.

Chapter 2: Immediatism and Colonization in Historical Perspective

In *William Lloyd Garrison*, published in 1913, John Jay Chapman lamented the negative image that continued to plague radical abolitionists decades after the Civil War. “They have never had a heyday,” Chapman said. “Their cause triumphed but not they themselves.” He expressed hope that Americans in a later age—farther removed from the animosity generated by anti-slavery agitation and the destruction of war—might view radical abolitionists in a kinder light. Chapman would be disappointed. While the immediatists’ reputation has waxed and waned over the years, their motives remain a matter of scholarly debate.³²

In the aftermath of the war, with the slaves freed but much of the South in ruins, Chapman and other writers sought to portray the radical abolitionists as moral heroes who bravely did what had to be done. Some of these writers were immediatists themselves or, like Chapman, had close ties to participants in the anti-slavery movement. Among other weaknesses in their accounts, these traditionalists did not address the thorny question of why radical abolitionism materialized in the 1830s. Slavery—and strains of abolitionism—had been present at the nation’s birth. Why had radical abolitionist-heroes not emerged in the 1790s or 1810s instead? In *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844*, Gilbert Hobbs Barnes theorized that the 1820s provided a religious impetus for the advent of radical abolitionism. Barnes’ work spawned a revisionist school, which from the 1930s to the 1960s brought renewed and generally unkind scrutiny to immediatist motivation. Many revisionists portrayed radical abolitionists as fanatics who pushed the nation into war. (This school of thought prevailed during and after World War II, also blamed on fanatics.) Radical abolitionists underwent rehabilitation during the 1960s—the

³² John Jay Chapman, *William Lloyd Garrison*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1921), 60, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/williamlloydgar02chapgoog> (accessed November 18, 2013).

U.S. civil-rights movement generated a wave of sympathy for freedom fighters of the earlier era—yet historians still struggled to come to grips with why radical abolitionism emerged when it did. More recent theories have focused on northern economic and cultural change.³³

The traditionalists asserted that radical abolitionists acted from an abundance of courage and morality. Chapman said Garrison, “the apostle of a new theory—Immediate Emancipation,” brought a “selfless egotism” and “inner light of conscience” to his labors. Immediatism meant not that the slaves should be emancipated at once but that concrete steps toward abolition should begin immediately. Like Garrison, Chapman minced no words on the subject of colonization, calling the movement a “sham” and its adherents puppets of the slavocracy. In emphasizing the sinfulness and horrors of bondage, traditionalist works bring to mind the anti-slavery tracts of the 1830s that glutted the mails and incensed the South. In *Anti-Slavery Days: A Sketch of the Struggle which Ended in the Abolition of Slavery in the United States*, published in 1883, radical abolitionist James Freeman Clarke described the visceral reaction that slavery aroused in him and contemporaries who had encountered or studied it. “Even now, when it is all over, the flesh creeps, and the blood curdles in the veins, at the account of the dreadful cruelties practiced on the slaves in many parts of the South,” he said. “I would advise no one to read such histories to-day unless his nerves are very well strung.”³⁴

³³ John Jay Chapman was the grandson of Garrison devotee Maria Weston Chapman. Wendy Hamand Venet, *Neither Ballots Nor Bullets: Women Abolitionists and the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), 4, Google Books, <http://www.google.com/search?tbo=p&tbm=bks&q=isbn:081391342X> (accessed June 20, 2013); McCulloch, 108; Merton L. Dillon, “The Abolitionists: A Decade of Historiography,” *Journal of Southern History* 35, no. 4 (November 1969), 500-503, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2206837> (accessed June 20, 2013); James L. Huston, “The Experiential Basis of the Northern Antislavery Impulse,” *Journal of Southern History* 56, no. 4 (November 1990), 609-612, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2210930> (accessed July 2, 2013); Gilbert Hobbs Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844: The Story of the First American Revolution for Negro Rights*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), xxxiii.

³⁴ Chapman, 35, 38, 47, 63; Walters, *American Reformers*, 79; James Freeman Clarke, *Anti-Slavery Days: A Sketch of the Struggle which Ended in the Abolition of Slavery in the United States* (New York: John W. Lovell Co., 1883), 101, Google Books, http://books.google.com/books/about/Anti_slavery_Days.html?id=kBzVAAAAMAAJ (accessed June 27, 2013).

In underscoring the horrors of slavery and rectitude of radical abolitionists, the traditionalists may have been trying to secure for the anti-slavery movement the credit and esteem that Chapman found lacking. If so, that was not their only goal. Some traditionalists attempted to establish a hierarchy in the pantheon of radical abolitionists. For Chapman, top billing went to Garrison. Likewise, Garrison's sons, Wendell Phillips Garrison and Francis Jackson Garrison, asserted their father's primacy in *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879: The Story of His Life Told by His Children*, a four-volume work published in 1885. They described Garrison as the founder and embodiment of the movement. The sharp-tongued Garrison was the most reviled abolitionist of his era—even many of his colleagues found him vexing—so Chapman and Garrison's children had ample incentive for shoring up his reputation. Other traditionalists objected to the Garrisons' book, claiming it exaggerated Garrison's importance and understated the contributions of his contemporaries. Those critics included William Birney, whose father, James G. Birney, had freed his slaves and moved north to join the radical abolitionist movement. In 1890, with publication of *James G. Birney and His Times: The Genesis of the Republican Party with Some Account of Abolition Movements in the South before 1829*, the younger Birney, who had been a Union army officer, attempted to correct what he described as mistakes and prejudices in the Garrisons' account. That meant promoting his own father's standing as an anti-slavery agitator and a founder of the Liberty Party, a vehicle for the kind of anti-slavery political activity that Garrison deplored.³⁵

³⁵ Chapman, 6-8; Venet, 4; McCulloch, 112; Wendell Phillips Garrison and Francis Jackson Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879: The Story of His Life Told by His Children* (New York: The Century Co., 1885), 1:xi, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/williamlloydgarr00garr> (accessed June 20, 2013); William Birney, *James G. Birney and His Times: The Genesis of the Republican Party with Some Account of Abolitionist Movements in the South before 1828* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890), vi, viii-x, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/jamesgbirneyhist00birm> (accessed June 27, 2013).

While the traditionalist school declined in the 1930s, vestiges occasionally surfaced afterward. The title of Margaret C. McCulloch's 1941 book, *Fearless Advocate of the Right: The Life of Francis Julius LeMoyne, M.D., 1798-1879*, foreshadows the hero worship within. McCulloch said LeMoyne's anti-slavery sentiment evolved from "his earliest principles to respect and treat justly every human being, however poor and lowly" and might have been stoked by the sight of shackled slaves led through the town of Washington on the National Road. Mob violence against anti-slavery men further steeled his resolve to let the radical abolitionist viewpoint be heard. But McCulloch showed how difficult it can be to assign historians to a historiographical camp. She acknowledged that religious and economic forces—the staple of revisionist and post-revisionist writing—also played upon the immediatists' minds.³⁶

Barnes' work represented a sharp break with traditionalism. First, he theorized that a quest for salvation—not selfless righteousness—spawned radical abolitionism. Second, by suggesting a personal motive for anti-slavery activism, Barnes weakened the connection between immediatism and slavery. Barnes traced the advent of radical abolitionism to the Second Great Awakening, an evangelical movement that swept upstate New York in the 1820s. This period of revivalism, associated with the preaching of Charles Grandison Finney, upended Calvinist notions of damnation. Finney suggested that the faithful could save their souls through benevolent acts and thus, Barnes said, the great preacher unleashed a variety of reforms from temperance to radical abolitionism. Barnes downplayed Garrison's importance in the movement, noting that *The Liberator*, Garrison's newspaper and greatest contribution to the cause, had a relatively minor circulation and was read mainly by a black population with little clout. Instead, Barnes emphasized the role of Theodore Dwight Weld and his so-called Band of Seventy, who

³⁶ McCulloch, 106, 108, 111, 113, 115.

braved mob violence in some towns to convert crowds to the cause. Weld was a Finney disciple who became the American Anti-Slavery Society's most famous speaker, and Barnes drew heavily on Weld's papers in crafting his account. Of Weld's skill, Barnes said, "Usually after the second night—though sometimes not for a week—the violence died. Then Weld reaped his harvest. Again and again, audiences of hundreds rose for immediate abolitionism..."³⁷

In the introduction to the 1964 edition of *The Anti-Slavery Impulse*, William G. McLoughlin said Barnes could not decide whether his subjects were fanatics or heroes. Other revisionists had no doubts. Avery Craven believed Barnes helped to show that the abolitionists' radicalism pushed the nation into war. In *The Coming of the Civil War*, published in 1942, Craven asserted that the conditions of slavery had been exaggerated by the "wildest assertions of pre-war extremists," and he suggested that radical abolitionists acted to fill voids in their own lives. If slavery had not made so convenient a target, Garrison—raised in a disadvantaged household, eager for fame, a rebel by nature—would have found something else to oppose. Even the more likable Weld had unusual qualities—such as an excessive modesty and over-the-top asceticism—that translated well into anti-slavery work. Craven believed a religious impulse and shifting economic landscape in the North could have helped to trigger the abolitionists' predisposition for radical activity. While Chapman sought admiration for the anti-slavery movement, Craven pushed scholarship in the other direction. He lauded revisionists for exposing the immediatists' recklessness. "Those who force the settlement of human problems by war," he said, "can expect only an unsympathetic hearing from the future."³⁸

³⁷ Barnes found the "long forgotten" papers of Theodore Dwight Weld and Angelina Grimké Weld. Barnes, 7, 9, 11-12, 50, 81, 106-107; Dillon, 503-504; Huston, 611; William G. McLoughlin, "Introduction to the Harbinger Edition," in *The Anti-Slavery Impulse*, vii-viii.

³⁸ McLoughlin, xv; Avery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), vii, 117, 124, 128, 136-137.

By the 1960s, however, scholarly attacks on the radical abolitionists had become passé, partly because historians had moved beyond efforts to find scapegoats for the Civil War and partly because the civil-rights movement cast anti-slavery work in a more respectable light. In this post-revisionist era, admiration for immediatists, even Garrison, increased. Irving H. Bartlett reflected the tenor of the times in a 1965 essay praising Wendell Phillips' morality, oratory and stoicism. Bartlett delighted even in the vituperative nature of Phillips' speech. "He had a way," Bartlett said, "of treating his opponents as if they were socially beneath him as well as morally loathsome." Bartlett's flattery rivaled that of the traditionalists, but other post-revisionist biographical accounts were more clear-headed. In *Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War against Slavery*, published in 1969, Bertram Wyatt-Brown balanced admiration for his subject with a careful analysis of Tappan's work. He did not claim primacy for Tappan among radical abolitionists, even though the merchant had helped to bankroll the movement. He praised Tappan's strengths (diligence, managerial ability and compassion) but noted his limitations (he was neither an idea man nor an electrifying speaker). As if anticipating a revisionist backlash, Bartlett and Wyatt-Brown took pains to describe their subjects as emotionally healthy individuals who used legitimate, moderate measures to combat a societal evil. Wyatt-Brown maintained that radical abolitionists could not have suspected that their work would precipitate a war. That statement is difficult to believe, however, given the colonizationists' assertions that they alone had a plan for eradicating slavery while preserving the union.³⁹

³⁹ Dillon, 500-501; Huston, 611-612; Irving H. Bartlett, "The Persistence of Wendell Phillips," in *The Antislavery Vanguard: New Essays on the Abolitionists*, ed. Martin Duberman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 106-107, 109, 111-113, 117-118; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War against Slavery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969), viii-ix, xii, xiv, 110-111; Early Lee Fox, *The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1919), 143, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/americancoloniza00foxe> (accessed October 28, 2013).

The evolving view of the anti-slavery movement did not halt questions about radical abolitionist motivations—but it did reframe the inquiries. As Ronald G. Walters demonstrated in a pair of 1978 books, theories about the immediatists’ psychological makeup gave way to wide-ranging scrutiny of the North’s culture and economy. In *American Reformers, 1815-1860*, Walters said, “America’s economic development provided reformers with problems in need of solutions.” According to Walters, radical abolitionists not only despised the South’s backwardness but feared urbanization and industrial capitalism portended a different kind of malaise for the North. Their real crusade was against “loss of moral control” in both sections of the country. In *The Antislavery Appeal: American Abolitionism After 1830*, Walters argued that the Second Great Awakening could not have been the only impetus for radical anti-slavery because some immediatists, such as the Quaker John Greenleaf Whittier and the Unitarian Samuel J. May, were outside the evangelical tide. Walters cited a constellation of impulses—including concern about immorality and decline of the family unit in both sections of the country—that not only explained the timing of radical abolitionism but reformers’ simultaneous interest in temperance, Sabbatarianism and other social issues. In *The Antislavery Rank and File: A Social Profile of the Abolitionists’ Constituency*, published in 1986, Edward Magdol acknowledged various religious and cultural precipitants but zeroed in on an economic explanation for radical abolitionism. Correlating occupational data with the membership rolls of anti-slavery societies in a handful of Massachusetts and New York factory towns, he argued that immediatism had strong appeal among the emerging middle and working classes—groups with a

vested interest in free-labor ideology and concerns about workplace changes wrought by industrialization.⁴⁰

For some, the scholarship had ranged too far afield. In “The Experiential Basis of the Northern Antislavery Impulse,” published in 1991, James L. Huston argued that modern studies of radical anti-slavery had become so focused on northern social and economic conditions that the most obvious catalyst of the movement—slavery—all but vanished from the conversation. “In current studies of abolitionism,” he said, “one never encounters a slave at all.” He urged historians to remember the experiential impetus for radical abolitionism—the visceral reaction to brutality and misery that inspired activists (such as James Freeman Clarke and F.J. LeMoyne) in a moral undertaking.⁴¹

In recent years, historians have revisited the moral imperative and documented for the first time the role that women and free blacks played in the radical anti-slavery movement. Though the participation of women was a controversial topic in the 1830s and helped to splinter the movement in 1840, the story of female immediatists only recently has been told through such works as Wendy Hamand Venet’s *Neither Ballots Nor Bullets: Women Abolitionists and the Civil War* and Julie Roy Jeffrey’s *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement*. In her 1998 work, Jeffrey used letters, diaries and anti-slavery society records to document the contributions of thousands of women in the North and Midwest. Some lectured and wrote anti-slavery treatises while others more discreetly “pricked the consciences of friends” and found other ways to incorporate anti-slavery activism into daily routines. Eric Foner acknowledged the work of black abolitionists in 2010, with publication of *The Fiery Trial*:

⁴⁰ Walters, *American Reformers*, 6, 83, and *The Antislavery Appeal: American Abolitionism after 1830* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978), 39, 53, 72, 80, 93; Edward Magdol, *The Antislavery Rank and File: A Social Profile of the Abolitionists’ Constituency* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), xiii-xiv, 6, 43, 50, 68.

⁴¹ Huston, 609, 620.

Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery. Foner called the anti-colonization activism of free blacks one of two key factors (the other being white evangelical fervor) in the rise of radical abolitionism. In *Abandoned Tracks: The Underground Railroad in Washington County, Pennsylvania*, W. Thomas Mainwaring explained that this “new brand of militant, black abolitionism” filtered into southwestern Pennsylvania and that some black abolitionists had crossed paths, if not actually worked, with F.J. LeMoyne.⁴²

Literature on the colonization movement also has focused on motive. Scholars continue to wrestle with the question of whether the American Colonization Society functioned mainly as an anti-slavery organization or as a vehicle for promoting racism, the slavocracy and racial homogeneity in the new republic. Some society members clearly worked to effect manumissions and suppress the international slave trade, but they had little success, overall, in reducing the number of American slaves in the forty-five years before the Civil War. That is partly because slavery expanded to accommodate cotton production during the period. While some Colonization Society members labored from sincere anti-slavery convictions, the organization also included Southern planters seeking to rid the country of free blacks and Northerners who, doubting the races could co-exist in America, saw colonization as the only way out of a racial dilemma. From the 1920s through the 1950s, Eric Burin has argued, scholars widely regarded the Colonization Society as an anti-slavery group. Burin said that view was challenged from the 1960s through the 1980s and had been thoroughly repudiated by the end of the 20th century. Yet it would be more accurate to say that a note of equivocation pervaded the literature of each period. In no era did scholars completely dismiss the society’s anti-slavery element or gloss over its racist aspects.

⁴² Venet, ix-x; Julie Roy Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 8-9, 21; Eric Foner, *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010), 19; W. Thomas Mainwaring, *Abandoned Tracks: The Underground Railroad in Washington County, Pennsylvania* (forthcoming), 69, 71.

These conflicting forces reflect the aims of the society's founders, who courted diversity of membership and ideology so as to make the colonization scheme common ground for as many Americans as possible. The most straightforward position on colonization came from the nation's free-black community, which consistently opposed it.⁴³

Like the radical abolitionists, colonizationists were accused of misguided and selfish motives. And, as was the case with the immediatists and their cause, early historians of colonization asserted the movement's benevolence. In *The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840*, Early Lee Fox stressed the organization's efforts to rally diverse groups around an anti-slavery agenda—an agenda, he claimed, that differed from the radical abolitionists' crusade only in tone and method. The Colonization Society pursued the twin goals of ending slavery and preserving the union. If colonization publications sometimes muted anti-slavery rhetoric, they did so to avoid alienating Southerners whose support was needed to keep the entire enterprise from collapsing. But the Colonization Society was no friend of the slavocracy. Fox asserted that extant society papers contain little pro-slavery sentiment and that the organization never secured a beachhead in the parts of the Deep South with the greatest numbers of slaves. Fox noted that Colonization Society members repeatedly decried the nature of bondage, facilitated the manumission of "thousands of slaves" and not only lobbied for the 1819 federal Anti-Slave Trade Act but persuaded the government to make agents and money available to repatriate illegally seized Africans. By suggesting that radical abolitionism undermined the society's work,

⁴³ Foner, 19; Eric Burin, "Rethinking Northern White Support for the African Colonization Movement: The Pennsylvania Colonization Society as an Agent of Emancipation," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 127, no. 2 (April 2003), 198-200, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20093619> (accessed October 27, 2013); Christopher Clark, *Social Change in America: From the Revolution through the Civil War* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006), 125.

Fox attempted to counter critics who asked why the Colonization Society, if committed to emancipation, had not effected a greater number of manumissions.⁴⁴

Isaac Brown, the biographer of Colonization Society co-founder Robert Finley, stressed his subject's humanitarian character. Brown concluded that Finley had a general desire to improve humankind and felt a particular compassion for the black race. A visit to South Carolina, where he observed slavery, deepened Finley's disgust for the institution. Brown was Finley's friend—he lived with Finley's family while preparing for college—and a colonizationist. Brown described the founding of the Colonization Society as a "milestone in abolitionism," a turn of phrase reflecting what he believed to be the organization's real aim. True, at the society's first meeting in 1816, organizers pledged to work only with free blacks willing to emigrate to Africa. Yet Brown said Finley believed from the outset that colonization would encourage manumissions and that the settlement and Christianization of Africa would diminish the slave trade—"because where the gospel makes its appearance, there Satan's kingdom gradually diminishes." Finley's goals remained at the heart of the organization through the work of colleagues such as Ralph R. Gurley, the society's longtime corresponding secretary. In *Mission to England, in Behalf of the American Colonization Society*, an 1841 account of his expedition to court the support of British colonizationists, Gurley described the society's goals as manumission, preserving the union, ending the slave trade and Christianizing Africa. Racist sentiment had no place in his account. Addressing widespread skepticism in some quarters, including the African American community, Gurley insisted that the society had no intention of deporting free blacks against their will.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Fox, 9, 11, 15, 17, 49-50, 127, 216, 219.

⁴⁵ Isaac V. Brown, *Biography of Rev. Robert Finley, D.D., of Basking Ridge, N.J.: With an Account of His Agency as the Author of the American Colonization Society; Also, a Sketch of the Slave Trade; a View of our National Policy and That of Great Britain toward Liberia and Africa*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1857), vii-viii, 92-94,

In 1961, at the end of the period during which writers looked most kindly on the Colonization Society, P.J. Staudenraus offered the most comprehensive defense of the organization yet. He took a broader view than previous writers, tracing the origins of colonization to the same period of benevolence—the Second Great Awakening—that Barnes found formative for the radical abolitionists. While writers such as Brown and Gurley spoke of benevolent leanings, Staudenraus provided the cultural context to explain why colonizationists acted as they did. Some of the parallels with radical abolitionism are striking: Staudenraus said the Second Great Awakening, which visited the South as early as the 1790s, engendered a Godly stirring for “love of His creatures.” That included the poor, the unchurched and the black race, and this affection found a structured, expansive outlet in centrally organized groups, such as the Colonization Society. If there is a major difference in the impulses described by Staudenraus and Barnes, it is that the former believed colonizationists acted from “disinterested benevolence” while the latter argued that radical abolitionists had a personal motivation—salvation—for doing good deeds. Eric Burin asked how Staudenraus could describe the Colonization Society as an anti-slavery organization “yet devote only two pages to the subject of slave liberations.” The explanation is that Burin failed to credit the society’s campaign against the slave trade, clearly a dimension of anti-slavery work. Staudenraus went into considerable detail—certainly more than two pages—about Colonization Society efforts to push the Anti-Slave Trade Act through Congress and otherwise stamp out human trafficking. Activity relative to the slave trade should be part of any examination of the society’s anti-slavery work.⁴⁶

116, 119, 148-149, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/stream/biographyrevrob00browgoog#page/n5/mode/2up> (accessed November 2, 2013); R.R. Gurley, *Mission to England, in Behalf of the American Colonization Society* (Washington: William W. Morrison, 1841), 2, 5, 8, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/stream/missiontoenglan00gurl#page/2/mode/2up> (accessed December 2, 2013).

⁴⁶ Burin, 198; Clark, 119-120; P.J. Staudenraus, *The African Colonization Movement, 1816-1865* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), 12-14, 17, 50-51.

While emphasizing the benevolent aspects of the American Colonization Society, early writers did not shrink from a discussion of unflattering topics. Brown and Staudenraus gave extended accounts of the society's inaugural meeting, at which Henry Clay, Elias Caldwell and John Randolph insisted that the organization not interfere with slavery in the South. Fox cited Clay's reservations about wandering, uneducated, unemployable freedmen. Even Finley seemed conflicted about freed blacks. With colonization, Brown quoted him as saying, "we should be cleared of them." Many early writers were quite candid about the society's strengths, weaknesses and mixed motives. Perhaps they had to be, with radical abolitionists and their defenders prepared to hold colonizationists' feet to the fire.⁴⁷

If the standing of radical abolitionists rose during and after the U.S. civil-rights era, it is not surprising that the reputation of colonizationists declined. In the revisionist scholarship of this period, colonization's humanitarian impulses were acknowledged but downplayed, and the main impetus for colonization routinely was ascribed to whites' self-interest. Racism was seen as having permeated the movement wherever it took root. The revisionist school included *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South*, Ira Berlin's 1974 work, and Leon F. Litwack's 1961 book, *North of Slavery: The Negro in the Free States, 1790-1860*. Berlin said the push for colonization came amid concerns that free blacks, if left in America, inevitably would chafe against measures to circumscribe their liberty. Litwack stressed the political and practical barriers to uplifting the race. Better, some Northerners and Southerners agreed, to dispose of free blacks altogether. While some colonizationists disliked slavery, Berlin argued, they considered free blacks "even more objectionable." Berlin noted that colonization had stronger support in the Upper South, which had many free blacks, than in the Deep South, which had relatively few.

⁴⁷ Brown, 99, 103-113; Staudenraus, 26-29; Fox, 33.

This point suggests that racism rather than anti-slavery sentiment drove the colonization movement—and it undermines Early Lee Fox’s argument that a lack of support in the Deep South was testament to the society’s anti-slavery convictions. Litwack said the Jim Crow laws targeted by twentieth-century civil-rights activists had their roots in Northern efforts to restrict the mobility and opportunities of free blacks before the Civil War. Moreover, he said some colonizationists supported these strictures in the belief that they would encourage free blacks to emigrate.⁴⁸

Colonization’s racist overtones were not confined to the North and Upper South but reached into the developing Midwest and Far West, too. In his 1967 work, *The Frontier against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy*, Eugene H. Berwanger noted that colonization overtures in the Old Northwest were aimed at free blacks, not at masters who might manumit slaves, and that colonizationists there measured their progress not in numbers of manumissions but by diminution of the free-black population. Such assertions help to explain why the reputation of colonizationists waned during the era of Freedom Riders and lunch-counter sit-downs.⁴⁹

Some historians of anti-slavery have discounted the colonization movement altogether. In his study of nineteenth-century reform movements, Ronald G. Walters gave brief treatment to colonization. He said the Colonization Society included “slaveholders, prominent politicians and distinguished men of the sort who would later shun abolitionism ... Their solution was to get black people out of the country.” In *North Star Country: Upstate New York and the Crusade for*

⁴⁸ Ira Berlin, *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South*, 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 103; Leon F. Litwack, *North of Slavery: The Negro in the Free States, 1790-1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), viii, 20-22, <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/duquesne/docDetail.action?docID=10286138> (accessed November 7, 2013).

⁴⁹ Eugene H. Berwanger, *The Frontier against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967), 1, 4, 51-52.

African American Freedom, published in 2002, Milton C. Sernett said colonization may have encouraged a modest number of manumissions but chiefly found support among Northern whites who did not want black workers competing for their jobs and undermining their wages. Sernett must have been referring to whites holding the most menial jobs or his assertion is at odds with Edward Magdol's findings about middle-class and working-class support for anti-slavery. Sernett's position on colonization reflected that of Frederick Douglass, the book's protagonist. Douglass was the nation's foremost black abolitionist, a vociferous opponent of colonization and a key figure in North Star Country immediatism. Sernett's book took its title from Douglass' newspaper, *The North Star*.⁵⁰

More favorable interpretations of colonization again are being written, and scholarship focusing on the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, an arm of the national organization, has been particularly generous. Kurt Lee Kocher's 1984 article, "A Duty to America and Africa: A History of the Independent African Colonization Movement in Pennsylvania," channeled Early Lee Fox. Kocher said Elliott Cresson, one of Pennsylvania's most ardent colonizationists, was as much an abolitionist as Garrison and that "the difference between the two men was in emphasis, not goals." Pennsylvania colonizationists certainly did not strive to create a racially pure state, Kocher said, noting that fewer than 220 Pennsylvanians emigrated to Liberia from the founding of the American Colonization Society in 1816 until 1859. Two other scholars, Eric Burin and Beverly C. Tomek, also have argued that Pennsylvania colonizationists were far more interested in liberating Southern slaves than in relocating the state's free blacks. In a 2003 article, "Rethinking Northern White Support for the African Colonization Movement: The Pennsylvania Colonization Society as an Agent of Emancipation," Burin noted that the Pennsylvania

⁵⁰ Walters, *American Reformers*, 78; Milton C. Sernett, *North Star Country: Upstate New York and the Crusade for African American Freedom* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2002), xiv, 22, 151.

Colonization Society facilitated manumissions in virtually every way it could. The state society's constitution listed emancipation as a goal, whereas the constitution of the American Colonization Society did not, and Pennsylvania colonizationists spoke frankly and often about this key aspect of their agenda. They also backed rhetoric with action. Burin noted that the Pennsylvania Colonization Society gave the national organization money to transport ex-slaves to Liberia and insisted at one point that state society funds not be used to ship free blacks overseas. The Pennsylvania society itself even purchased slaves and relocated them to Liberia. When the struggling parent organization appeared unable to capitalize on a Virginian's deathbed liberation of 110 slaves, colonizationists from Pennsylvania and New York joined forces to transport the freedmen to Liberia. If exposure to slavery was an "experiential touchstone" for some of the radical abolitionists, Burin said, manumission and resettlement of freedmen provided the same psychic reinforcement to Pennsylvania colonizationists. In "Colonization and its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania," published in 2011, Tomek concluded that colonization was "clearly an antislavery movement" and that many gradual abolitionists joined the Pennsylvania Colonization Society because they saw it as the only vehicle for carrying out their beliefs. The Pennsylvania Colonization Society infused emancipation into fund-raising appeals—"it had promised donors that every \$30 would secure the freedom of a slave," Tomek said. It also pressured American Colonization Society leaders to step up their anti-slavery rhetoric and criticized the national organization when efforts to send emancipated slaves to Africa lagged.⁵¹

⁵¹ As described below, the initial efforts of the Pennsylvania and New York colonizationists ended in tragedy. Burin, 199-200, 205-206, 210-211; Kurt Lee Kocher, "A Duty to America and Africa: A History of the Independent African Colonization Movement in Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania History* 51, no. 2 (April 1984), 125, 147, www.jstor.org/stable/27772966 (accessed January 11, 2014); Tomek, 4, 49, 95, 61, 112, 120-121, 128-129.

The colonization movement cannot be summed up tidily as anti-slavery or racist. The American Colonization Society contained an anti-slavery contingent, albeit one constrained by the prejudices of its time, and the strength of that contingent varied by place and time. Pennsylvania had a particularly strong anti-slavery element until the 1850s, when, according to Tomek, it began to concentrate on colonizing free blacks instead. A procession of colonizationists with strong anti-slavery convictions—figures such as Robert Finley and Elliott Cresson—kept the anti-slavery part of the agenda alive from the founding of the American Colonization Society to the Civil War. Certainly, the colonization movement contained racism. But racism also infected the ranks of radical abolitionists, some of whom would not mingle with those they wished to emancipate.⁵²

While much has been written about colonization and radical abolitionism, the intersection of the movements remains ripe for study. The scholarship so far has portrayed immediatists and colonizationists as sworn enemies, and that characterization may be apt if based on the content of partisan organs and the conduct of protagonists, such as Garrison, at the national and state levels of the movements. However, rank-and-file immediatists and colonizationists lived in small towns and rural areas, where they had little choice but to rub elbows with each other despite disagreements about slavery. John Jay Chapman said Garrison considered slavery “the only thing worth thinking about,” but that clearly was not true of radical abolitionists in Washington County, Pennsylvania, who also cared about social ties, the advancement of their families and community development. Chapman’s sentiment probably did not reflect the attitude of radical abolitionists in other small communities, either. To date, however, there has been little research showing how colonizationists and immediatists interacted locally.⁵³

⁵² Tomek, 179-180, 221; Wyatt-Brown, 176.

⁵³ Chapman, 6.

Leonard L. Richards is one of the few historians to explore immediatist-colonizationist interaction on the local level. But he addressed only one type of interaction—violent conflict—and left many questions about even that topic unanswered. Richards concluded that anti-abolition riots in the North and Midwest were part of a national upswing in mob violence during the 1830s and that colonizationists played a prominent role in attacks on radical abolitionists. He traced colonizationist violence to a confluence of factors, including fear of racial amalgamation, concern about foreign influence in the abolitionist ranks, the jarring impact of the abolitionists’ verbal assaults on colonization and bewilderment at the declining popularity of the colonization movement. In addition, he said many of the colonizationists were “gentlemen of property and standing” in their communities who saw the American Anti-Slavery Society’s proselytizing as a threat to their control, especially when anti-slavery appeals were made directly to women and children. Richards’ assessment remains influential; Eric Foner, in *The Fiery Trial*, cited Richards in asserting that colonizationists “instigated and participated in” violence against radical abolitionists.⁵⁴

But Richards was not as detailed as he should have been. He identified members of anti-abolition mobs in Cincinnati (July 1836), New York (July 1834) and Utica (October 1835) and provided occupational data and religious affiliations for radical abolitionists and rioters. But he did not say which rioters were members of the American Colonization Society or its auxiliaries, a peculiar oversight given his assertion about the pervasiveness of colonizationist participation in anti-abolitionist violence. For example, Richards asserted that “the rioters who attacked Elijah Lovejoy at Alton, Illinois, in November, 1837, identified openly with African colonization,” but he did not identify anyone by name or document any of the mobbers’ ties to the American

⁵⁴ Richards, 11, 13, 26, 30-31, 50-51, 61, 66-67, 131-132; Foner, 21-22.

Colonization Society. Beverly Tomek has faulted Richards for making unsubstantiated generalizations, saying there was a difference between membership in the society and shouting colonization slogans in the heat of the moment. “Many of these angry mobs shouted colonization rhetoric after the violence began and used colonization arguments to justify the attacks,” she said. “Too often, these statements have been taken at face value to conclude that the mobs were made up of colonizationists.” Tomek said her own research showed that colonizationists were not the source of anti-abolition mobs in Pennsylvania, but she cited little evidence for that conclusion. Tomek gave a detailed account of a mob’s fiery destruction of Pennsylvania Hall in Philadelphia in February 1838 but did not attempt to assign culpability. She noted only that colonizationists blamed “lower-class whites” for destroying the building and that a leader of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, Richard Rush, eventually helped to calm the mob and end the violence. The hall, four days old when it burned, was a joint project of gradualists and immediatists who needed meeting space. The two men indicted for the hall’s destruction, Samuel Yeager and Edgar Kimmey, do not appear to have been Colonization Society members.⁵⁵

In his national study of antebellum violence, *American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War*, David Grimsted did not even address Richards’ premise about colonizationist-led riots. Rather, Grimsted portrayed anti-abolitionist violence as Northerners’ half-hearted attempts to appease angry Southerners, and he suggested that some disturbances may have been fomented by Jacksonian politicians eager to shore up their party’s image in the South. He suggested that Congressman Samuel Beardsley, for one, instigated the Utica riot as a favor to the impending

⁵⁵ In addition to attacking Pennsylvania Hall, the mob that night attacked a black orphanage and a black church before Richard Rush dissuaded an assault on another house of worship. Richards, 30, 85, 92, 113, 139, 139-147, 171-175; Tomek, xiii, xv, xix, 225-228.

presidential candidacy of Martin Van Buren. Grimsted also asserted that the social standing of radical abolitionists and rioters was more varied than Richards portrayed.⁵⁶

If they recognized colonizationists among the rioters, radical abolitionists did not always say so publicly. F.J. LeMoynes offered no public comment about the motivations or makeup of the mob that attacked Samuel Gould in June 1836. That same month, the *Anti-Slavery Record*, a publication of the American Anti-Slavery Society, reported on the general surge in anti-abolition mobbing and gave abolitionists tips on how to respond to threats of violence. The *Record* said riots were encouraged by “gentlemen of property and standing” and carried out by disorder-loving members of the lower classes. But the paper did not accuse colonizationists of participation or complicity. That is a curious omission, given the abolitionist press’ habit of criticizing all facets of colonization as much as possible. Yet the finger-pointing evidently happened with some frequency. At the American Colonization Society’s twenty-first annual meeting, David Reese complained that colonizationists had become the general scapegoat for anti-abolition disorder. The *Colonization Herald*, a publication of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, was similarly indignant. Other than Richards, few scholars have plumbed the rioters’ backgrounds. Typical is John L. Myers’ “The Early Antislavery Agency System in Pennsylvania, 1833-1837,” which listed attacks on radical abolitionist speakers without providing information on the assailants or their motives.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ David Grimsted, *American Mobbing, 1821-1861: Toward Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 22, 26, 38, 46, 48, 70.

⁵⁷ Tomek, 224; Myers, 72-73, 75, 78, 82, 84, “Hints on Anti-Abolition Mobs,” *The Anti-Slavery Record*, July 1836, reprinted in American Anti-Slavery Society, *The Anti-Slavery Record*, Vol. 2 (New York: R.G. Williams, 1836), 73-82, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/antislaveryrecor02amer> (accessed January 5, 2014); “Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the American Colonization Society,” *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*, January 1838, reprinted in American Colonization Society, *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*, Vol. 14 (Washington, D.C.: James C. Dunn, 1838), 22-24, Google Books, http://books.google.com/books/about/The_African_Repository.html?id=jx8SAAAAIAAJ (accessed January 5, 2014).

The extent of colonizationist involvement in anti-abolition violence is still an open question, and other facets of colonizationist-radical abolitionist interaction remain wholly unexplored. To what extent, despite their differences on slavery, did the groups collaborate on other matters, at least on the local level? While scholarship has not directly addressed the issue, it has shown that the nature of anti-slavery work did vary by locale. This suggests that immediatists could tailor their activism to personal or community needs. Tomek cited Garrison's anger at radical abolitionists in Pennsylvania who refused to assail local gradualists with the vehemence he adjudged necessary. Could local social networks and business ties explain the immediatists' restraint? It was one thing for outsiders such as Garrison or Weld to sweep into a town and insult the populace but quite another for local immediatists to treat friends and associates in such a manner. Philadelphia's radical abolitionists may have considered temperate discourse the prudent way to advance anti-slavery without alienating the gradualists (and perhaps colonizationists) who were their partners on other issues.⁵⁸

This kind of pragmatism prevailed in south-central Pennsylvania. In his 2006 doctoral dissertation, Douglas G. Smith said confrontation simply did not work for radical abolitionists in Adams, Cumberland and Franklin counties. Sharing a border with Virginia, the area had "a distinctive, almost Southern, character." Not only did radical abolitionist marches and lectures antagonize unsympathetic residents, but the movement's base of support included Quakers and Mennonites uncomfortable with such tactics. So, radical abolitionists in the region concentrated on preventing the kidnapping of free blacks, offered as much legal protection as possible to accused runaway slaves and worked for passage of the state's 1847 personal liberty law. "South Central Pennsylvania abolitionists wielded such tools aggressively and effectively," Smith said.

⁵⁸ Tomek, 13. Tomek noted that some gradualists also were members of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society.

“They deliberately turned from Garrison-style organization to what was for them more effective, a legal and political strategy.”⁵⁹

More to the point, Andrew S. Barker showed that radical abolitionists could advance the cause—and win the praise of the movement’s national leaders—even if they befriended colonizationists or embraced other priorities along the way. In “Chauncey Langdon Knapp and Political Abolitionism in Vermont, 1833-1841,” Barker profiled a newspaper publisher and politician who opposed Garrison’s coarse rhetoric. Knapp described *The Liberator* as “calculated rather to exasperate than to convince.” Knapp opened his own newspaper to the colonizationist perspective, yet left no doubt about his own preference for immediatism. Moreover, Knapp’s Antimasonic activism sometimes took precedence over his radical abolitionism. When Garrison denounced the Reverend Chester Wright—a friend of Knapp who was a colonizationist writer and an Antimason—Knapp leaped to Wright’s defense. Though conflicted about his choice, Knapp in the 1830s supported an Antimasonic governor with a poor record on slavery. In time, Knapp joined the Whig Party and helped build support for radical abolitionism in the state legislature. James G. Birney praised Knapp’s anti-slavery work.⁶⁰

Another New England town’s experience showed that colonizationists and radical abolitionists had complex business and social ties that probably were not easily severed by the slavery debate. In 1837, according to David Grimsted, businessman and politician James S. Brooks helped to break up an anti-slavery lecture in Meriden, Connecticut, which had been arranged partly through the efforts of another businessman, radical abolitionist Elisha Cowles.

⁵⁹ David G. Smith, “On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870” (doctoral diss., Penn State University, 2006), 12-15, 17, 29-30, 64, 75, <https://etda.libraries.psu/paper/7274/2633> (accessed April 14, 2014).

⁶⁰ Andrew S. Barker, “Chauncey Langdon Knapp and Political Abolitionism in Vermont, 1833-1841,” *New England Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (September 2000), 445-452, 454, www.jstor.org/stable/366686 (accessed January 2, 2014).

Grimsted described Brooks as an “anti-abolitionist” who had worked for Cowles as a salesman and collaborated with him on a local railroad. However, the story is more complex than that. Records of the American Colonization Society list Brooks as a contributor in the 1840s.⁶¹ According to a local history, by the time of the 1837 disturbance, Brooks and Cowles already were working together to operate a bank and bring a railroad through Meriden. They jointly owned land that they sold for the railroad right-of-way. In addition, Brooks, Cowles and Isaac Tibbals, a member of the Meriden Anti-Slavery Society, owned a store together. Grimsted said Brooks may have participated in the riot to shore up his Jacksonian credentials (he went on to hold various distinguished political posts), but Brooks’ colonization ties speak to Richards’ thesis just as well. Grimsted did not cite—perhaps did not realize—Brooks’ involvement in colonization or the scope of his business dealings with radical abolitionists. It is likely that Brooks’ ties with his radical abolitionist associates survived his participation in the mob. In Meriden, as in Washington County, Pennsylvania, other priorities—namely, personal attainment and community development—enabled radical abolitionists and colonizationists to work together regardless of differences over slavery. The Brooks-Cowles story, not mentioned by Leonard Richards and only partially told by Grimsted, points to the untrod ground that awaits historians of colonization and radical abolitionism.⁶²

⁶¹ Grimsted, 47-48; “Receipts of the American Colonization Society, from the 20th March, to the 20th April 1847,” *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*, May 1847, reprinted in American Colonization Society, *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*, Vol. 23 (Washington, D.C.: C. Alexander, 1847), 161-162, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=zIkoAAAAYAAJ> (accessed January 5, 2014).

⁶² Grimsted, 47-48; City of Meriden, CT, *150 Years of Meriden: Published in Connection with the Observance of the City’s Sesquicentennial, June 17-23, 1956* (Meriden: City of Meriden, 1956), 69, 71, 209, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/150yearsofmeride00meri> (accessed January 5, 2014); Meriden Anti-Slavery Society, *Apology for Abolitionists: Addressed by the Anti-Slavery Society of Meriden, Conn., to their Fellow-Citizens*, 2nd ed. (Middletown, CT: C.H. Pelton, 1837), 32, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/apologyforabolit00anti> (accessed January 19, 2014); George Munson Curtis, “Meriden’s Early History,” in *A Century of Meriden, “The Silver City”: An Historic Record and Pictorial Description of the Town of Meriden, Connecticut, and Men Who Have Made It*, ed. C. Bancroft Gillespie (Meriden: Journal Publishing Co., 1906), Part I, 111, 301-302, 376n1, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/historicrecordpi00gill> (accessed April 13, 2014).

A better understanding of the grassroots relationship between immediatists and colonizationists would yield a clearer picture of both movements and the participants' motivations. If local immediatists and colonizationists routinely collaborated on civic initiatives, theories about the impetus for anti-slavery agitation are less robust than heretofore believed. That is, if radical abolitionists balanced anti-slavery work with community-development projects, they were neither the moral absolutists that Chapman lauded nor the fanatics that Craven described. In addition, a commitment to community improvement gives a new dimension to post-revisionist theories about the social and economic impulses for immediatism. Also, the colonization and radical abolition movements could have been more bifurcated than generally believed, with the national and state organizations out of step with local auxiliaries on strategy and tactics. In addition, evidence of collaboration between immediatists and colonizationists raises new questions about anti-abolition violence. Did social and civic bonds with radical abolitionists sometimes forestall colonizationist involvement in mob violence? And when colonizationists did riot, what factors drove them to do so? Could it have been the presence of outside agitators such as Samuel Gould? While it is unclear whether colonizationists participated in the Washington County riots, this thesis will demonstrate that colonizationists and radical abolitionists collaborated on pressing civic issues and suggests that such cooperation, forged by a web of social and business ties, likely existed in other locales. Focusing on the complex and contradictory forces motivating anti-slavery activists, this thesis seeks to reflect the post-revisionist schools of colonizationist and radical abolitionist scholarship.

Chapter 3: The History of Slavery in Washington County

Geography and a border dispute shaped Washington County's experience with slavery. Arriving in the 1760s and 1770s, the first white settlers hailed not only from other parts of Pennsylvania but from nearby areas of Maryland and Virginia. Some of the Southerners arrived with slaves, and so slavery developed strong support in Washington County. When Douglas G. Smith described south-central Pennsylvania as "almost Southern," he could have been talking about the southwestern part of the state instead. In fact, during Pennsylvania's long border dispute with Virginia, many settlers considered present-day Washington County to be part of the South.⁶³

The border dispute arose out of the conflicting charters that English monarchs granted to William Penn, who established Pennsylvania, and the London Company, which settled parts of Virginia. Into the 1780s, Pennsylvania and Virginia continued to fight for ownership of the Monongahela and Ohio river valleys, a swath of territory that stretched as far east as Pittsburgh. Each state operated its own courts, issued its own deeds and used force of arms against officials of the other government. At one point, Pennsylvania offered a compromise that would have ceded most of present-day Washington County to Virginia. However, Virginia rejected the proposal, demanding that the boundary be farther east. As late as 1779, Virginia continued to issue land certificates to settlers and speculators, including George Washington, who received title to more than 1,000 acres in Mount Pleasant Township. Both states approved a compromise

⁶³ Mainwaring, 17; Creigh, 33, 39; Boyd Crumrine, "The Civil and Legal History," in *History of Washington County*, 158-159; Robert Wallace Brewster, "The Rise of the Antislavery Movement in Southwestern Pennsylvania," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 22, no. 1 (March 1939), 2-3, <http://ojs.libraries.psu.edu/index.php/wph/article/view/2108/1941> (accessed October 14, 2013).

in 1780. Some of the Virginia supporters agitated for turning the disputed territory into a new state, but nothing came of the proposal.⁶⁴

As Pennsylvania and Virginia wrestled over the boundary, the former, yielding to pressure from an influential Quaker community, took initial steps to end slavery across the state. Under Pennsylvania's gradual-emancipation law of 1780, the first such law in the nation, children born of slaves after March 1 of that year could be held in bondage only until they turned twenty-eight. It did not free slaves born before 1780 and was, on the whole, a modest approach to emancipation.⁶⁵

In 1781, the Pennsylvania Legislature created Washington County out of a part of Westmoreland County. A year later, the legislature enacted a version of the gradual-emancipation law specifically for Washington and Westmoreland counties, a step taken partly because the border with Virginia had not been determined when the 1780 statute was enacted and authorities wanted to ensure compliance from settlers who considered themselves Virginians at that time. Pennsylvania's move to assert control over the region reportedly prompted some prominent slaveholders to move away. Enough Virginians remained, however, to form a sizable and influential contingent in the new county.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Boyd Crumrine, *The County Court for the District of West Augusta, Virginia, Held at Augusta Town, Near Washington, Pennsylvania, 1776-1777: With an Account of the County Courts for Ohio, Yohogania and Monongalia Counties, Virginia, Held 1777-1780* (Washington, PA: Washington County Historical Society, 1905), 10-11, 16-18, Mason and Dixon Line Preservation Partnership, <http://www.mdllpp.org/pdf/library/1905AccountofVirginiaBoundaryContraversy.pdf> [sic] (accessed October 7, 2013); Boyd Crumrine, "The Border Controversy Between Pennsylvania and Virginia: 1748-1785," *Annals of the Carnegie Museum* 1, no. 4 (September 1902), 509-511, 514-518, 522-524, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/stream/cu31924017918735#page/n9/mode/2up> (accessed February 26, 2015); Crumrine, "The Civil and Legal History," 159, 231-233.

⁶⁵ Crumrine, "The Civil and Legal History," 256-257; Mainwaring, 22-23; Brewster, 1-2; Finkelman, 400.

⁶⁶ Parts of Washington County were taken for the creation of Allegheny County in 1788 and 1789 and for Greene County in 1796. Creigh, 39-41; Finkelman, 401-402; Brewster, 3; Crumrine, "The Civil and Legal History," 257-258; Mainwaring, 19, 23-24.

Slavery took deeper root in Washington County than it did in many other parts of the state, but it was not the strongest slaveholding part of Pennsylvania. From 1790 through the 1830s, the population of slaves in the county diminished at a greater rate than elsewhere in southwestern Pennsylvania. In 1790, the 3,737 slaves in Pennsylvania made up less than one percent of the state's population. Among Pennsylvania's twenty-one counties that year, Washington County had the sixth-greatest number of slaves, 265, representing 1.1 percent of the county's population. By 1820, the growing state had 51 counties and 211 slaves, and Washington was one of six counties with five slaves each. Ten other counties that year had higher numbers of slaves. The ten included Greene, which had incorporated a part of Washington County in 1796, and Fayette, formed from a part of Westmoreland County in 1783. By 1830, Washington County had one slave. In all, more than 145 owners registered 639 slaves in Washington County between 1782 and 1820. Almost half of Washington County's slaveholders owned no more than one slave, who was used primarily for domestic or small-scale agricultural work.⁶⁷

Like gradual-emancipation laws, the earliest abolition societies in the North date to the early republican period. They were influenced by Quakerism, evangelical fervor and the notion that slavery was incompatible with a new nation founded upon republican virtue and inalienable human rights. During the nation's early years, some Americans believed slavery already was in decline for economic reasons and considered gradual abolitionism a way to hasten the institution's demise. Gradual abolitionism, a polite prodding of slaveholders often coupled with uplift of free blacks, sharply differed from the radical abolitionism of the 1830s. The

⁶⁷ Transcript of *Negro (Slave) Register of Washington County*; Creigh, 33; Mainwaring, 18, 20, 23; Historical Census Browser, University of Virginia, <http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/php> (accessed October 13, 2013); U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, *Heads of Families—First Census of the United States, 1790: State of Pennsylvania* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1908), 8, 10, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/headsoffamiliesa08unit#page/n111/mode/2up> (accessed October 9, 2013).

Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage and the Improvement of the Condition of the African Race, founded in the 1770s, reflected this formative strain of anti-slavery.⁶⁸

The rudiments of Washington County's anti-slavery movement can be traced to 1789, with the formation of the Washington Society for the Relief of Free Negroes and Others Unlawfully Held in Bondage. Though it was a chapter of the Pennsylvania Society, which had the three-pronged mission enumerated in its name, the local group evidently concerned itself only with the unlawful detention or enslavement of free blacks. That may have been because the society included slave owners, including Abalsom Baird, father of Judge Thomas H. Baird. Organization of the group was galvanized by the case of John Davis, a Washington County slave. Davis' owner, a Maryland native, failed to register him under the 1782 gradual-emancipation law enacted for Washington and Westmoreland counties. Instead of freeing Davis, as state law required when such oversights or violations occurred, Davis' owner took him to Virginia in 1788. Davis' white supporters in Washington County went to Virginia and spirited him back, but Davis' owner, in turn, arranged for the slave's kidnapping in Pennsylvania and return to the Old Dominion. Reminiscent of the recent border controversy, Virginia and Pennsylvania authorities each claimed primacy in the matter. A Pennsylvania court indicted the three kidnappers, but Virginia declined to return them or the slave to Washington County. In the end, Davis remained a Virginia slave, and Congress in 1793 passed a law on extradition and rendition making it more difficult for free blacks to prove their liberty and easier for kidnappers

⁶⁸ Tomek, 19-20, 27-28; Clark, 123-124; Walters, *American Reformers*, 78.

to ply a domestic slave trade. A direct result of the John Davis case, this was the nation's first federal law addressing the thorny issue of fugitive slaves.⁶⁹

The Washington Society for the Relief of Free Negroes and Others Unlawfully Held in Bondage eventually died out, but other anti-slavery organizations followed. The Western Abolition Society, formed in Washington in 1823, probably was another affiliate of the gradualist Pennsylvania Society. The Western Abolition Society attracted fifty people, including some of those who gravitated to radical abolitionism in the 1830s. No record of its work seems to have survived. Abolitionist activity in the county during this period was not confined to the town of Washington. A Centerville Abolition Society existed in 1827, and anti-slavery conventions, involving activists in Washington County and at least one other county, took place in 1830.⁷⁰

The Washington County Colonization Society was established by the mid-1820s. The initial members included the Reverend Matthew Brown, the Reverend Thomas Hoge, T.M.T. McKennan, Samuel Murdoch and John Grayson, all of whom remained loyal to the cause during the 1830s. Yet the early membership also included Joseph Henderson, Samuel Hazlett, Samuel McFarland and John S. Brady, all of whom by 1834 or 1835 had gravitated to the county Anti-Slavery Society. Such defections were not unusual. James G. Birney, for example, was an agent of the American Colonization Society before becoming a radical abolitionist. The county Colonization Society at some point fell moribund, until the specter of radical abolitionism prompted a revival in 1834.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Mainwaring, 30-31; Finkelman, 402, 419-420; Whitfield J. Bell Jr., "Washington County, Pennsylvania, in the Eighteenth Century Antislavery Movement," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 25, nos. 3-4 (September-December 1942), 137, <http://ojs.libraries.psu.edu/index.php/wph/article/view/2233/2066> (accessed October 9, 2013).

⁷⁰ The Western Abolition Society members who became radical abolitionists included Ephraim Estep, John McCoy and Thomas McKeever. Table 1; Mainwaring, 64, 67; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 546.

⁷¹ Samuel Murdoch's last name sometimes was spelled Murdock. American Colonization Society, "Tenth Annual Report," 96; "Public Meeting," June 7, 1834; William Birney, 112.

With the 1820s uptick in anti-slavery agitation came another court case that focused attention on Washington County and tested the intent of the state's gradual-emancipation laws. Alfred Dwilling, the son of a twenty-eight-year slave, sued his would-be owner, John Miller, in Washington County Court in November 1824. Dwilling claimed that he was born free under the gradual-emancipation laws. Miller claimed that Dwilling inherited the duty of servitude from his mother and owed him twenty-eight years of service. A county jury found in Dwilling's favor, but Miller appealed. In an 1826 decision with statewide ramifications, the state Supreme Court agreed with Dwilling. As Chief Justice William Tilghman observed, "If the argument in favour of servitude be correct, the Legislature of Pennsylvania, though it abolished slavery for life, established a kind of slavery, a servitude until the age of twenty-eight years, which may continue from generation to generation to the end of the world."⁷²

The John Davis and Alfred Dwilling cases illustrate the county's ambivalence toward slavery. On the one hand, the Washington Society for the Relief of Free Negroes and Others Unlawfully Held in Bondage received so much criticism for its defense of free blacks that several members quit the group. In a letter to the parent Pennsylvania Society, a member of the Washington group complained that it had "the prejudice of the people, the disapprobation of the magistrates ... and corrupt officers to contend with."⁷³ In reviewing the county's slave register, W. Thomas Mainwaring discovered that numerous residents unlawfully registered the children of twenty-eight-year slaves with the aim of holding them in servitude. Yet on the other hand, despite the considerable support that slavery had in the county, a jury of white men sided with

⁷² "Miller v. Dwilling," in *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*, Vol. 14, ed. Thomas Sergeant and William Rawle Jr. (Philadelphia: McCarty and Davis, 1828), 442-443, 446, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/pennsupremecourt14penniala#page/446/mode/2up/search/dwilling> (accessed October 8, 2013).

⁷³ Quoted in Bell, 139, and Mainwaring, 31.

Dwilling in what must have been a controversial, closely watched case. Moreover, that jury may have been helped to its decision by Washington County President Judge Thomas H. Baird, himself a study in contrasts on slavery.⁷⁴

While instructing the jury, Baird gave his view that Miller “has no title to the servitude of the plaintiff.” The comment may have been prejudicial and given Miller ammunition for his appeal, but the Supreme Court nonetheless affirmed the jury’s verdict. Baird’s father, Absalom, was a Revolutionary War doctor, one of Washington’s early settlers and the treasurer of the Washington Society for the Relief of Free Negroes and Others Unlawfully Held in Bondage. He owned no slaves at the time of the 1790 census, but registered three between 1797 and 1805. Though he is not listed as such either in the 1790 census or the county slave register, Judge Baird appears to have been a slave owner, too. In 1814, before his appointment to the bench, he advertised in a local paper for the return of a “runaway Negro fellow” who was “a thief and liar.” In 1828, Baird sentenced a Kentucky slave, Christian “Kit” Sharp, to be hanged for murdering his master. It was a strange case in which Baird’s brother, William, a colonizationist, and Samuel McFarland, the future radical abolitionist, were defense attorneys, and John S. Brady, also a future radical abolitionist, served as a prosecutor.⁷⁵

Judge Baird was a colonizationist who disdained the immediatist agenda of the 1830s. He was among those who blamed radical abolitionists for the violence against Samuel Gould in June 1836 and, though the reasons are not clear, he grew to dislike F.J. LeMoyne. “Dr. LeMoyne is out of my books,” he said in an April 1842 letter to his son-in-law, Robert R. Reed, who was

⁷⁴ Mainwaring, 33.

⁷⁵ John McCoy, Sr. was a member of the jury that convicted Sharp. It is not known whether this was the same John McCoy who joined the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society in the 1830s. Table 1; Mainwaring, 27; “Miller v. Dwilling,” 442; Transcript of *Negro (Slave) Register of Washington County*; Crumrine, “The Civil and Legal History,” 244-245; Crumrine, “Maj. Samuel McFarland,” in *History of Washington County*, 564; Bell, 137; Creigh, 368-369; U.S. Department of Commerce, *Heads of Families—First Census*, 246.

LeMoyne's friend. "I have lost confidence in him both as a man and a physician." Baird headed the Colonization Society auxiliary in Williamsport in southeastern Washington County. The size of the auxiliary, formed in 1836, is not known. Though not an officeholder in the county Colonization Society, the judge clearly wielded considerable influence, and contemporaries described him as very active in the movement. His muddled position on slavery haunted him into the 1850s, when his name was floated for U.S. Senate. Baird correctly realized that his chances of being sent to Washington, D.C.—Pennsylvania's U.S. Senate seats at the time were filled by the state Legislature—were nil. "The anti-slavery element will no doubt have decided influence in the Legislature—and the misrepresentation of my views and feelings on that subject may prejudice me ... I have been 'conservative' but never 'pro-slavery.' ... I have never advocated involuntary servitude," he insisted to his son-in-law, adding that the Dwilling case freed "20 or 30,000 coloured persons." When Baird's opponents tried to portray him as pro-slavery, a friend told a Philadelphia newspaper, "Judge Baird in all the relations of life has been a law-abiding, consistent and benevolent friend of the colored race, not an abolitionist or pro-slavery, but an American."⁷⁶

The development of anti-slavery sentiment in Washington County progressed from the very narrow objectives of the late 1780s and early 1790s to a broader (but still gradualist) stance in the 1820s and then to the radicalism of the 1830s. Although Beverly Tomek described the flourishing state of gradual abolitionism in parts of Pennsylvania during the 1830s, the strain seems to have disappeared from Washington County by the end of the 1820s. F.J. LeMoyne and

⁷⁶ As recounted below, Baird in 1863 begged Congress to embrace colonization as a mechanism for ending the Civil War. Appendix to *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll*, 47; "Town Meeting," *Washington Examiner*, June 25, 1836; Letter from Joseph Mills to F.J. LeMoyne, August 2, 1837; Beers, 1:152; Letter from Thomas H. Baird to Robert R. Reed, April 5, 1842, and letter from Thomas H. Baird to Robert R. Reed, November 22, 1854, Archives of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, hereafter HSWP Archives, Papers of the Reed Family, MSS#135, Folder 2.

other radical abolitionists acknowledged religious, economic and social impulses for embracing immediatism. Although Washington County had not developed the kind of industrial economy that Magdol identified in other Northern towns, its status as a growing and progressive commercial hub, with a growing middle class, might have brought heightened unease about slavery, for colonizationists and radical abolitionists alike. Bondage had all but vanished from the county by the 1830s. But the sight of slaves trudging the National Road—between the slave states of Maryland and Virginia—may have provided the kind of “touchstone” that James Huston and Eric Burin referenced. The county’s colonizationists and radical abolitionists jointly considered slavery out of step with the times. If they disagreed on how to combat it, they were of like mind on many other subjects.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Tomek, 159, McCulloch, 45, 160; Magdol, 19; Huston, 609; Burin, 200; “Address of the Anti-Slavery Society of Washington County to their Fellow Citizens,” *Washington Examiner*, August 15, 1835. The address sets out the religious, economic and social reasons for opposing slavery.

Chapter 4: The Resuscitation of Washington College

Well before the advent of radical abolitionism, Washington's leading citizens learned how a disagreement among them could send the town into a tailspin. The dispute, which arose out of a minister's fire-and-brimstone sermons about leisure activities, nearly caused the demise of Washington College. The incident likely remained fresh in the minds of Washington's colonizationists and radical abolitionists as the groups jockeyed for influence—and decided how to parry each other—throughout the 1830s.⁷⁸

In 1805, the Reverend Matthew Brown arrived in the town of Washington to become the first permanent pastor of the First Presbyterian Church and principal of the church-affiliated Washington Academy. Within a year, thanks to Brown's efforts and those of attorney Parker Campbell, the state Legislature granted a charter upgrading the academy to a college. The college quickly became a source of civic pride, a symbol of progress on the recent frontier. Brown won widespread respect for his efforts. But he also offended part of the congregation and some of the college trustees with sermons in which he demonized card-playing and other leisure activities that had become popular pastimes with some of the town's elites. In particular, Brown clashed with John Hoge, a college trustee from 1806 to 1808 and a son of town founder David Hoge. In a letter to John Hoge dated June 30, 1806, Brown defended his sermons, which he described as "censures on your principles and conduct," and vowed not to be silenced. Brown added, "You say that you have reigned and that you will reign over this place. Know, sir, that you shall not reign over me or my family or oblige us to surrender our liberties into your hands."

⁷⁸ Helen Turnbull Waite Coleman, *Banners in the Wilderness: Early Years of Washington and Jefferson College* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1956), 105-106, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/bannersinthewild012852mbp> (accessed July 17, 2013).

Hoge replied, “I have received your declaration of independence and know not whether I ought most to admire your insolence or pity your folly.” Hoge accused Brown of theological errors—of having “mangled those sermons which ‘censured my principles and conduct’”—and of setting a bad example by gossiping and mingling with the town’s riffraff in front of taverns. “Your own folly will destroy you ... I need only deal with you as God does with the sinner—Leave you to yourself,” Hoge said. He called Brown “unfit for any place above that of a country curate” and described him as a “monument to remind the students of Washington College that a little cunning is a dangerous thing.”⁷⁹

Brown’s opponents eventually undermined him by eliminating the arrangement that allowed him to serve the college and church simultaneously. On December 2, 1816, college trustee Parker Campbell introduced a resolution asserting that it was in the “interests of this college and the cause of science” for the president to give the institution his “undivided attention.” The resolution, praising Brown’s “high talents, important services and great fidelity,” said the board hoped to secure *his* undivided attention. The measure—really intended to force Brown’s ouster from the college—was not put to a vote at that meeting. But days later, the board took up the matter again. Asked about the proposal, Brown said he would give up the college, not the congregation, if the college trustees forced him to relinquish one position. If given an ultimatum, he added, he would resign from the college immediately. “After what has passed, and my own views of the origin, the tendency of such a resolution and its aspect toward myself,” he said, “I would consider that I had lost the confidence of a majority of the board.” Again, the

⁷⁹ Washington Academy was the kind of college preparatory school typical of the period. John Hoge’s brother, William, donated four lots that served as the grounds of Washington Academy and later as the college campus. Coleman, 42-43, 102-107; Letter from Matthew Brown to John Hoge, June 30, 1806, W&J Archives, Folder VII-A-c-1; Letter from John Hoge to Matthew Brown, July 2, 1806, W&J Archives, Folder VII-A-c-3; W&J, *Catalogue*, 265; Creigh, 150-151; Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 476-477.

board delayed taking action. On April 30, 1817, however, the board voted ten to seven to require that the president devote his full attention to the job. The minority, led by Alexander Reed, inserted into the minutes a statement describing the vote as an injustice to Brown and a disservice to a college that had made great progress during his tenure. Hinting at the personal conflict at the root of Brown's ouster, Reed's statement noted that "wanton innovations in prosperous circumstances are frequently pernicious." Brown resigned days before President James Monroe visited the college to express his admiration for the town's progress—achievements wrought largely by Brown.⁸⁰

At the April 30 meeting, the board replaced Brown with Reverend Andrew Wylie, who had only recently resigned his post as president of the rival Jefferson College at nearby Canonsburg. The minority of trustees who opposed Brown's ouster criticized the younger Wylie's credentials and the stealth by which the majority had recruited him. After serving as pastor of First Presbyterian for five more years, the still unhappy Brown resigned that post to become the president of Jefferson College. The moving about of Wylie and Brown exacerbated tension between the schools, which had come close to merging about 1815. Students who otherwise would have enrolled at Washington College followed the popular Brown to Canonsburg, and Jefferson College began to enroll classes of record size. Wylie superintended his own improvements in Washington but proved unable to overcome the divisions and ill will generated by Brown's travails there. Even outsiders, such as the British traveler Adlard Welby, could sense the difficulty. After a visit to Washington in August 1819, Welby wrote that the college "has now only forty-five students, owing to the dismissal of a favourite president and the appointment of one not liked." His frustrations unresolved, Wylie resigned the college

⁸⁰ Creigh, 171; Minutes of the Washington College Board of Trustees, hereafter Washington College minutes, September 22, 1816, October 3, 1816, December 2, 1816, December 16, 1816, and April 30, 1817, W&J Archives.

presidency in December 1828. Reverend Obadiah Jennings, who had replaced Brown as church pastor in 1822, had left town months earlier. “We are really deprived of Mr. Jennings,” Thomas Baird’s wife, Nancy, wrote to her daughter, Eleanor Reed, in April 1828. “I fear it will be a long time, if ever, we have such another.” When Jennings preached his farewell sermon, she said, “there was not one dry eye left [in] the house I am certain.” Times were bleak. As Helen Turnbull Waite Coleman noted, “The church was empty; the college was empty. The entire town felt the depression . . . It must have seemed almost like a lost town, with few opportunities for its youth.”⁸¹

Chastened, the church and college asked Brown to return after expressing a willingness to rescind the policy prohibiting one person from serving both institutions simultaneously. Brown considered the offer but declined. The college trustees then offered to rehire Wylie, but he refused. Two other ministers, John Stockton and Abraham Anderson, also turned down the job. Rudderless, the college shut down. In 1829, seven students received diplomas even though the college did not function. Early the next year, the trustees resolved to “resuscitate the institution, if practicable.” They offered the presidency to Reverend David Elliott, Brown’s onetime assistant at Washington Academy, but he refused. Two more ministers, David McConaughy and Joseph Biggs, also declined. In 1830, the college graduated no students. That September, however, David Elliott, newly hired as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, agreed to serve also as college president on an interim basis. More than a year later, he arranged for McConaughy to lead the college on a permanent, full-time basis. It was, the Reverend James I.

⁸¹ Jefferson College began as an academy in 1791 and received a college charter in 1802. Washington College minutes, April 30, 1817, and December 9, 1828; W&J, *Catalogue*, 8; Beers, 1:153; Coleman, 48, 59, 70-71, 78-81, 106-107, 112, 117-119; Adlard Welby, *A Visit to North America and the English Settlements in Illinois, with a Winter Residence at Philadelphia: Solely to Ascertain the Actual Prospects of the Emigrating Agriculturist, Mechanic, and Commercial Speculator* (London: J. Drury, 1821), 54-55, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/details/visittoorthamer00welb> (accessed July 21, 2013); Letter from Nancy Baird to Eleanor Reed, April 17, 1828, HSWP Archives, Papers of the Reed Family, MSS#135, Folder 1.

Brownson said at the college's semi-centennial celebration years later, a chance at rebirth. The college's two-year suspension of operations "had seriously affected the interests of the town and depressed the spirit of the people," he said. "Many of the best houses were without occupants. The value of property was greatly reduced, and business, instead of advancing, was suffering a general decline." The experience, he said, showed Washington how vital the college had become.⁸²

Elliott, the president for fourteen months, and McConaughy, who held the post for approximately eighteen years, each took office with that sentiment in mind. In his inaugural address, Elliott said, "The occasion on which we are assembled is one of importance not only to you but to the community ... Whether this resuscitation shall ultimately prove honorable to those immediately concerned in it, and profitable to the community, will depend much on the manner in which the institution shall be conducted." He called for the "united and active confidence of the board of trustees and of the good citizens of this borough" and suggested that Washington's leaders be inspired by the example of Jefferson College, then enjoying great prosperity under Matthew Brown. In his own inaugural speech, McConaughy told the community that the college's "prosperity and usefulness are, to you, eminently clear." He reminded trustees of their "high and honorable trust" to safeguard the institution and added, "May its auspicious revival be as the morning light which shines more and more unto the perfect day." A postscript to McConaughy's address noted that enrollment already was increasing and the institution's future brightening.⁸³

⁸² W&J, *Catalogue*, 264; Washington College minutes, December 9, 1828, January 12, 1829, March 9, 1829, March 20, 1829, March 21, 1829, April 28, 1829, October 9, 1829, February 1, 1830, February 26, 1830, April 7, 1830, July 16, 1830, August 6, 1830, September 21, 1830, and September 28, 1830; Coleman, 126-128; James I. Brownson, "Historical Address," in *Proceedings and Addresses at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of Washington College, Held at Washington, Pennsylvania, June 17th, 18th, and 19th*, 1856 (Pittsburgh: J.T. Shryrock, 1857), 40-42.

⁸³ W&J, *Catalogue*, 264; David Elliott, *An Inaugural Address Delivered November 2, 1830, by the Reverend David Elliott, A.M., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy and Political Literature and Acting Principal of*

Having averted the college's collapse, the trustees were not likely to endanger the institution or town a second time because of a disagreement over slavery. From the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society in December 1833 through the end of the decade, twenty-three men served as college trustees for varying periods. At least three—F. J. LeMoyne, Joseph Ritner and Reverend Charles Wheeler—were abolitionists. At least eight—including Alexander Reed, Robert R. Reed, Congressman T.M.T. McKennan, Thomas McGiffin and David Elliott, who joined the board upon resigning the college presidency—were colonizationists.⁸⁴ McGiffin, like Alexander Reed, had been a slave owner. The trustees worked harmoniously throughout the decade, even though their backgrounds and activism on the slavery issue had the potential to be divisive. LeMoyne in 1837 was elected the inaugural president of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society. Ritner, the state's governor from 1835 to 1839, demonstrated radical abolitionist credentials with a December 1836 message to the state Legislature in which he attacked slavery and its supporters. John Greenleaf Whittier wrote a poem, "Ritner," lauding the governor's address. Ritner also attended the inaugural meeting of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society. By 1838, Robert R. Reed was a vice president of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society. Also that year, McGiffin was the organizing chairman of the Pennsylvania Union Convention, held in Harrisburg to oppose radical abolitionism, support colonization and urge the federal government to avoid interfering in the slavery issue.⁸⁵

Washington College, PA (Washington, PA: John Grayson, 1830), 3, 10-11; David McConaughy, *Inaugural Address, Delivered May 9, 1832, by the Reverend David M'Conaughy, on His Induction to the Office of President of Washington College* (Washington, PA: John Grayson, 1832), 4; "Postscript," in McConaughy, *Inaugural Address*, 17.

⁸⁴ Wheeler resigned March 26, 1834, after fifteen years on the board. No reason for his resignation was given in the trustees' minutes. The other known colonizationists on the board were William Baird, John L. Gow and Isaac Leet. Baird died October 6, 1834. Table 1; W&J, *Catalogue*, 265-266.

⁸⁵ Transcript of *Negro (Slave) Register of Washington County*; W&J, *Catalogue*, 265-266; PASS convention, 61-62; "Public Meeting," June 7, 1834; Edward W. Biddle, *Governor Joseph Ritner* (Carlisle, PA: Hamilton Library Association, 1919), 4-5, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/governorjosephri00bidd> (accessed January 30, 2014); "The Pennsylvania Union Convention"; Appendix to *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll*, 45.

During this period of stability on campus, the college rebounded. It graduated three students in 1831, five in 1832 and no fewer than ten annually for the rest of the decade. It graduated eighteen students in 1835 and twenty-six in 1836. “The class which is now to graduate is much larger than any that has left the institution,” a letter writer informed the *Washington Examiner* before the 1836 commencement. By the college’s semi-centennial in 1856, James I. Brownson could boast that more than 500 had received diplomas “since the revival of 1830.” Some alumni had gone on to distinguish themselves as congressmen, governors or college presidents. Growing enrollment and standout alumni were not the only ways to measure the college’s progress, either. The trustees hired additional faculty members, two of whom, W.P. Alrich and R.H. Lee, stayed for more than twenty years. A new building, which would come to be called Old Main, was completed in 1836. That summer, the trustees voted to purchase additional property in anticipation of continued growth.⁸⁶

A spirit of tolerance pervaded the campus. Despite his role as a manager of the county Colonization Society, McConaughy evidently maintained good relations with LeMoyne and Ritner. The college was home to a student Colonization Society, which formed shortly after the town’s May 1834 public debate about abolition and colonization. The *African Repository and Colonial Journal* reported, “It is believed that a large majority of the members of this college are entirely in favour of the Colonization Society.” The faculty included at least four colonizationists—Alrich, Lee, W.K. McDonald and John L. Gow. The college continued to attract students from the South, graduating seventy-four from Virginia, nine from Maryland, two from Louisiana and one each from North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee between 1833

⁸⁶Washington College minutes, April 4, 1836, and June 24, 1836; W&J *Catalogue*, 268, 288-305; Brownson, “Historical Address,” 45, 50; McCulloch, 128; “Commencement of Washington College,” *Washington Examiner*, September 24, 1836.

and 1861. If slavery had been a divisive issue on campus, Southerners likely would have stayed away.⁸⁷

The trustees' diligence reflected the town's long-term commitment to education, a pattern broken only by the two-year shutdown of the college. The community's first foray into higher education—the founding of Washington Academy in 1787, six years after the county's formation—helped settlers forge a sense of community and progress on a frontier that was cut off from much of the state by the Allegheny Mountains. Converting the academy to a college signaled a further commitment to progress. Indeed, in criticizing Matthew Brown in 1806, John Hoge complained that the minister's poor judgment threatened to undermine “the celebrity of our school and put an end to our prospects.” When President James Monroe visited Washington in 1817, Andrew Wylie noted that the town was “just commencing its ascent in the scale of improvement.” Monroe replied: “In providing for the happiness and prosperity of a country, a careful attention to literary institutions and the education of youth ought ever to occupy a high place.” College trustees—colonizationists and radical abolitionists alike—assigned such importance to the work that some served for extended periods: Alexander Reed from 1830 until his death in 1842, Thomas McGiffin from 1810 until his death in 1841, T.M.T. McKennan from 1818 until his death in 1852 and David Elliott from 1832 to 1853. Joseph Ritner served from 1827 to 1852 and F.J. LeMoyne from 1830 through the eventual merger with Jefferson College in 1865. Having committed themselves to the college, these civic leaders allowed neither slavery nor other disagreements to get in the way.⁸⁸

⁸⁷“Public Meeting,” June 7, 1834; Table 1; W&J *Catalogue*, 268, 288-371; “Auxiliary Societies,” *African Repository and Colonial Journal*, July 1834, reprinted in American Colonization Society, *African Repository and Colonial Journal*, Vol. 10, (Washington, D.C.: James C. Dunn, 1834), 148, Google Books, http://books.google.com/books/about/The_African_Repository_and_Colonial_Jour.html?id=RYsoAAAAYAAJ (accessed February 2, 2014).

⁸⁸ Letter from John Hoge to Matthew Brown, July 2, 1806; Brownson, “Historical Address,” 35-36, 39; Monroe quoted in Creigh, 171-172; W&J, *Catalogue*, 265-266.

While they evidently held civic duty in high regard, trustees also had selfish motives for working together. Education, business climate, the town's stability and the fate of the town's leading families were inextricably linked. If the college served as a vehicle for instilling community values and preparing future generations of town leaders, it also was a way to help individual families move ahead, build traditions and expand social and business networks. F.J. LeMoyne, T.M.T. McKennan and Robert R. Reed were among the school's early graduates. Their sons, grandchildren, in-laws and other relatives followed them as alumni, trustees and professional mentors to later generations of students. Analysis of commencement data showed that, overall, F.J. LeMoyne had familial, social or professional ties to at least seventeen of those who graduated between 1808 and 1889. T.M.T. McKennan had ties to at least forty of those who graduated during the same period. In all, eleven of the county's known radical abolitionists and eighteen of its known colonizationists had familial, social or professional ties to at least 164 of those who graduated between 1806 and 1880. These ties transcended the slavery debate. F.J. LeMoyne provided medical mentoring to David Elliott's son, Thomas, an 1836 graduate. Similarly, T.M.T. McKennan's son, Thomas, an 1842 graduate, studied medicine with radical abolitionist W.L. Lafferty, who was himself the recipient of an honorary degree from the college. Radical abolitionist James Reed's sons graduated in 1842 and 1843. One studied medicine with LeMoyne and the other law with T.M.T. McKennan.⁸⁹

The college simultaneously attracted outsiders to the growing town and kept local men from leaving the area. James I. Brownson is a case in point. The native of Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, graduated from Washington College in 1836. He taught school in Bucks County,

⁸⁹ The county had multiple families named Reed. Some Reeds, such as Alexander and Robert R., were colonizationists while others, such as James, were radical abolitionists. It is virtually certain that the county's colonizationists and radical abolitionists had ties to more than the 164 graduates documented here. Table 2; W&J, *Catalogue*, 385, 389-390; "Reed Family to Assemble for Reunion Next Weekend."

Pennsylvania, before becoming a minister and returning to Washington, where he was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church for 50 years. He also served as interim president of Washington College from July 1852 to September 1853 and of its successor, Washington and Jefferson College, in 1870. Brownson's second wife, Eleanor, was a sister-in-law of Jane Acheson, who was the daughter of colonizationist John Wishart. Brownson's four sons were college graduates, and all spent at least part of their careers in Washington. Brownson's historical accounts of the community's institutions and leading figures remain valuable today. When Brownson spoke at the 1856 semi-centennial about the college's importance, he drew on personal experience. Brownson's family became part of the community fabric—part of its web of social and professional connections—only because radical abolitionists such as LeMoyne and colonizationists such as McKennan and Robert R. Reed worked together during the 1830s.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Table 2; Coleman, 131-132; Beers, 1:27-28, 74, 78-80; Brownson, "*Historical Address*," 41; W&J, *Catalogue*, 295, 381, 427, 435, 458.

Chapter 5: The Founding of Washington Female Seminary

After the Revolutionary War, the challenges of citizenship and nation-building fueled an expansion in education. The founding of Washington Academy and Washington College—all-male, all-white institutions—reflected this trend. But education for white women also expanded during the republic's formative period. Finishing schools for upper-class girls gave way to a more inclusive system of female seminaries that taught academic subjects such as literacy, logic, math and science. Charles C. Beatty, who in 1829 founded Steubenville (Ohio) Female Seminary with his wife, Hetty, declared that misguided chivalry for too long had kept women from the usefulness they owed to themselves and society. He said, "When the sum of woman's duties, and the important uses for her intellectual culture are properly, not to say fully understood, it will be seen to be in many respects more necessary that she should have a sound and thorough education, than that the other sex should have." A rapid increase in female educational opportunities occurred from 1820 to 1850. By the mid-nineteenth century, the literacy skills of white women equaled those of white men.⁹¹

Evangelical fervor, which stirred concern for women's souls, was partly responsible for this cultural shift. With improved education, women would be better able to do God's work, uplift their communities and earn their own salvation. Second, an evolving view of the family

⁹¹ Leonard I. Sweet, "The Female Seminary Movement and Woman's Mission in Antebellum America," *Church History* 54, no. 1 (March 1985), 41-42, 45-47, <http://www.jstor.com/stable/3165749> (accessed February 20, 2014); Anne Firor Scott, "What, Then, is the American: This New Woman?" *Journal of American History* 65, no. 3 (December 1978), 679, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1901418> (accessed February 20, 2014); Charles Clinton Beatty, *Lecture on the Formation of Female Character* (Steubenville, OH: Wilson and Harper, 1848), 12, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=Lr5YAAAACAAJ> (accessed February 20, 2014); James I. Brownson, "Biographical Sketch," in *Memoriam of Rev. Charles Clinton Beatty, D.D., L.L.D., of Steubenville, Ohio, and of His Wife, Mrs. Hetty Elizabeth Beatty*, hereafter Beatty Memoriam (New York: J.J. Little & Co., 1883), 42-43, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/memoriamofrevcha00brow> (accessed February 20, 2014).

and the requirements of republican citizenship combined to give heightened importance to female education. As the exemplars of American virtue and the first teachers of young citizens, white women needed a broader base of knowledge than before. “Let it not now be supposed that we are now insisting upon or recommending a system of mental training for some favored classes of society,” Beatty said in his *Lecture on the Formation of Female Character*. “We are advocating the proper education of the whole sex.” If women were not educated about substantive things, he said, their superficiality would drag down everyone around them.⁹²

Economic forces drove the change, too. Factory production in the Northeast deprived women of home-based financial opportunities at the same time that an expansion of common schools—another aspect of the post-Revolution education boom—provided a new employment option. The growth of seminaries correlated with the spread of common schools and the nation’s increasing population. Although seminaries were not designed specifically to turn out teachers, their alumnae filled many of the new positions in public schools because men had other employment opportunities. For the first time, women came to dominate a profession. Some contemporary observers, discerning a parallel between teaching and motherhood, believed that women made the better educators of young pupils anyway. The early republican period also gave birth to the gendered pay scale. Communities happily paid a female teacher less than her male counterpart.⁹³

In establishing one of the earliest female seminaries west of the Allegheny Mountains, the Beattys helped to set the trend. Charles Beatty considered the school an extension of his work as a pastor of Presbyterian churches in Steubenville. He provided oversight of the seminary, and

⁹² Sweet, 43-44, 48, 50, 53; Scott, 681-682, 686, 689; Beatty, 13

⁹³ Scott, 682; Keith E. Melder, “Woman’s High Calling: The Teaching Profession in America, 1830-1860,” *American Studies* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1972), 19-23, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40641074> (accessed February 20, 2014).

his wife handled the day-to-day management of the institution. The couple toured other schools, including New York's esteemed Troy Female Seminary, before opening their own. By the time they turned over the school to new leaders in the 1860s, as many as 3,000 young women had passed through the seminary's doors. The Beatties' curriculum reflected contemporary conventions: It endeavored to test students without exhausting them or challenging gender roles unduly. Beatty said, "It was never intended by the God of nature that woman should stand out in bold relief, as rising to the highest intellectual eminence, or be conspicuous among mankind for any mental force. It is contrary to her tendencies." He asserted that education would enhance, not diminish, a woman's respect for her domestic duties and make her a devout, wise influence within the home.⁹⁴

The Beatties' seminary quickly had an impact on Washington County, Pennsylvania, about thirty-five miles to the southeast. Some Washington families, recognizing the emerging value of female education, put their daughters under the Beatties' tutelage. But sending young ladies away to school did not befit a town attempting to outgrow a frontier image. Washington's leading citizens opened their own seminary with forty pupils in 1836, and the institution survived for more than a century, providing prestige, stability and economic benefit to the community. F.J. LeMoyne's daughter, Charlotte LeMoyne Wills, recalled "my parents discussing the question of sending me away to the Steubenville seminary, and the great need of having a good school in town ... Great was my joy, and that of my companions, when we learned that we were to have a school of our own, and need not go away from home." Academically and demographically, the seminary complemented Washington College. And even more than the college, the seminary showed the ability of colonizationists and radical abolitionists to work

⁹⁴Brownson, "Biographical Sketch," 24, 33-34, 42, 45; Beatty, 11, 14; A.M. Reid, "Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Hetty Elizabeth Beatty," in Beatty Memoriam, 124-125.

together and the extent to which their personal and professional interests were linked to the town's prosperity. It was one thing for immediatists and colonizationists to put a college back on track during the 1830s; it was another for them to start a seminary from scratch. The latter enterprise entailed a remarkable degree of collaboration, coordination and financial commitment, an unlikely feat if colonizationists and radical abolitionists were in constant conflict over slavery.⁹⁵

In November 1835, T.M.T. McKennan, the congressman and colonizationist, held an initial meeting in his home to discuss establishing the seminary. Joining him were colonizationists David Elliott, William Hunter, Jacob Slagle, William Smith and seven other men whose views on slavery could not be determined.⁹⁶ The number of organizers and supporters quickly multiplied to include at least nine more colonizationists, Samuel Cunningham, John L. Gow, John Grayson, Joseph Lawrence, David McConaughy, Daniel Moore, John Wishart, Alexander Reed and Robert R. Reed, and at least nine radical abolitionists, F.J. LeMoyne, John S. Brady, Samuel Hazlett, Samuel McFarland, James McCoy, Samuel Mount, Alexander Sweney, Joseph Templeton and Samuel Vance. Immediatists and colonizationists worked together on committees to draw up building plans, develop articles of incorporation, hire teachers and raise funds through sales of stock. Charlotte LeMoyne Wills recalled, "In the winter of 1835-

⁹⁵ Charlotte LeMoyne Wills, "History of the First Twenty-Five Years," in *Semi-Centennial Celebration of Washington Female Seminary, 1836-1886, Washington, Penna., June 8, 1886, and General Catalogue of the Alumnae* (Philadelphia: Thomson and Brother, 1886), 19-20; Roxana Bentley Gamble, untitled address, in *Washington Female Seminary, Commemorative and Farewell Reunion of the Graduates and Teachers of Washington Female Seminary in Honor of Mrs. Sarah R. Hanna, June 25, 1874*, hereafter *Washington Female Seminary, Commemorative and Farewell Reunion* (Pittsburgh: Bakewell and Marthens, 1874), 42-43, *Historic Pittsburgh*, <http://digital.library.pitt.edu/cgi-bin/t/text/text-idx?c=pitttext;view=toc;idno=31735056286952> (accessed February 12, 2014).

⁹⁶ The seven included James Reed and Robert Officer. It could not be determined whether this was James Reed the radical abolitionist or James Reed the Washington College professor whose views on slavery are not known. Officer was a Colonization Society member in the 1820s, but it is unclear whether he remained so in the 1830s. Creigh 199; American Colonization Society, *The Eleventh Annual Report of The American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: James C. Dunn, 1828), 109, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/stream/annualreportame05socioog#page/n8/mode/2up> (accessed May 6, 2014).

36, a sufficient amount of stock was subscribed to warrant them in opening a school, and to erect a seminary building.” McKennan and LeMoyne were part of the committee that negotiated with Alexander Reed for the purchase of lots—once a brickyard—for the school. Wills said Reed sold the property for \$250, “a low price because of the purpose to which it was devoted.”⁹⁷

Colonizationist Isaac Leet, then a legislator, helped secure a state charter for the institution. The initial nine-member board of trustees comprised one radical abolitionist, seven colonizationists and one man whose view of slavery could not be determined.⁹⁸ The original group of thirty-two stockholders included at least four immediatists and at least nine colonizationists. Though the stock was supposed to pay dividends when the seminary reached a level of financial stability, it is doubtful that shareholders ever profited. At the time of David McConaughy’s death in 1852, for example, his seminary stock had no value.⁹⁹

During the seminary’s first few years, various developments could have derailed immediatist-colonizationist cooperation. In June 1835, a few months before T.M.T. McKennan held the first meeting for organizing the school, native Liberians attacked a new settlement at Bassa Cove and killed about twenty ex-slaves who had been transported there with the help of Pennsylvania colonizationists. To Washington’s immediatists, the tragedy must have seemed proof of the colonizationists’ folly. The immediatists could have leveraged the incident for propaganda purposes, but they do not appear to have done so. The following year, mobs

⁹⁷ Alexander Sweney’s last name sometimes was spelled “Sweeney.” Creigh, 199-200; Wills, 20; Table 1.

⁹⁸ The immediatist was LeMoyne and the colonizationists were Gow, Grayson, Lawrence, McConaughy, Robert R. Reed, Slagle and Wishart. Wills, 21; Creigh, 251, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, “An Act to Incorporate the Washington Female Seminary, in the Borough of Washington, in the County of Washington, and for Other Purposes,” in *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1837-38, in the Sixty-Second Year of Independence* (Harrisburg: Theo: Fenn, 1838), 402.

⁹⁹ The radical abolitionist stockholders were Hazlett, LeMoyne, McCoy and Sweney, and the colonizationist stockholders were Elliott, Grayson, Hunter, McConaughy, McKennan, Alexander Reed, Slagle, Smith and Wishart. Wills, 20; Table 1; Letter from T.M.T. McKennan to Moses McClean, March 1, 1852, W&J Archives, Folder VII-D-j-4.

menaced Samuel Gould, the American Anti-Slavery Society agent, in Washington and Williamsport. These events—and knowledge of anti-abolitionist violence in other Northern and Midwestern cities—might have strained relations between colonizationists and radical abolitionists. However, there is no evidence that collaboration on the seminary was imperiled. The growing prominence at this time of F.J. LeMoyne in the radical abolition movement and of Robert R. Reed in colonization circles does not seem to have posed any difficulty, either.¹⁰⁰

As they did for Washington College, immediatists and colonizationists served together as seminary trustees throughout the 1830s and into the post-Civil War era. Colonizationists Grayson and Slagle served from 1838 to 1873, while radical abolitionist Sweney served from 1839 to 1866. F.J. LeMoyne served from 1838 to 1858 and again from 1873 until his death in 1879. The men not only oversaw the seminary's operation but helped to administer exams and otherwise showed a personal interest in the institution's progress. Mary Newton Gregg, an 1843 graduate, recalled that LeMoyne, Wishart, Grayson, Sweney, Slagle and McFarland were "among the public-spirited citizens whom we seminary girls knew in a friendly way." Said 1840 graduate Mary J. Haft, "Let us thank heaven that in those days there were found men clear-sighted enough to discern that the elevation of woman is also the elevation of man." Charlotte LeMoyne Wills said the seminary gave students some of the "happiest and most profitable hours of our youth." Referring to the seminary's publicly held exams, Wills said, "How we appreciated the kindness of Mr. McKennan, or good Mr. Slagle, when they would say, 'Let her try it again!' or 'Don't be afraid, girls, speak out.'"

These were hardly the recollections of women whose school days were colored by an immediatist-colonizationist feud. Particularly insightful are the

¹⁰⁰ The colonizationists rebuilt the colony at Bassa Cove. In fact, it was for this colony that Elliott Cresson solicited funds during his visit to Washington County in 1836. Tomek, 93-95; Richards, 30; PASS convention, 61-62; Appendix to *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll*, 45; Gould and LeMoyne letters in *The Friend of Man*; "Meeting in Williamsport," August, 6, 1836; "Colonization Proceedings," May 28, 1836; Forrest, 1:419-420;

comments by Wills, daughter of the region's foremost radical abolitionist, about colonizationists McKennan and Slagle.¹⁰¹

Analysis of graduation data helps to explain the depth of the men's commitment to the seminary. The county's radical abolitionists and colonizationists had familial or social ties to at least thirty women who graduated from the seminary between 1839 and 1853. Those alumnae included John Wishart's daughter, Margaretta; John Grayson's daughter, Martha; W.P. Alrich's daughter, Susan; and Charlotte LeMoyne Wills and her sisters, Ann, Romaine and Jane.¹⁰²

Martha Grayson, who graduated in 1842, gave this account: "I recall one evening, when a little child, resting upon my father's knee, hearing him speak of the deep necessity of educating women, and the vast work for good that lay before those who embraced with earnestness this estimable privilege. Turning to me, he said: 'Above all, do not neglect your mind.'" Wills noted that prominent citizens who supported the all-male college "also were the fathers of tenderly loved daughters, and desired for them corresponding opportunities for improvement." The commitments to family and community were interwoven. Roxana Bentley Gamble, who graduated in 1844, said most of the seminary's founders "desired the improvement and benefit of their own daughters; but they also looked wider and farther, and labored for the good of the community, with true wisdom and benevolence." In keeping with family and community ties, men's service to the seminary was intergenerational. Sons of F.J. LeMoyne, Alexander Reed, T.M.T. McKennan and John Wishart served on the board. So did one of LeMoyne's sons-in-law. One of Alexander Reed's daughters-in-law taught at the seminary. One of McKennan's

¹⁰¹ "Trustees," in *Semi-Centennial Celebration of Washington Female Seminary*, 50; Wills, 17, 24; Mary Newton Gregg, "Reminiscences," in *Washington Female Seminary, Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 22; Letter from Mary J. Haft, in *Washington Female Seminary, Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 18-19.

¹⁰² Table 3. The county's colonizationists and radical abolitionists surely had social or familial ties to far more than thirty of the students who graduated between 1837 and 1853, the period covered by one alumnae catalog. However, biographical material for the students is scarce.

daughters-in-law taught at the seminary and another was a graduate. The college and seminary operated in tandem to build up the county and town. In addition to his affiliation with the college, James I. Brownson served on the seminary's board of trustees. Reverend Thomas Hanna, the husband of longtime seminary principal Sarah Foster Hanna, served as seminary superintendent and as a college trustee.¹⁰³

Not all of Washington's families—not even all of its prominent families—availed themselves of the school. But the Washington Female Seminary achieved the founders' desired ends. It provided in-town schooling for Washington's young women and drew students from other locales, including the slave states. At least seventeen of the women who graduated between 1838 and 1854 married Washington College alumni. The seminary heightened Washington's reputation. The school's 1854 catalog described Washington “as one of the chief towns in western Pennsylvania, containing over 3,000 inhabitants, generally industrious, intelligent and moral. It is one of the most fertile spots in the West, surrounded by picturesque scenery, and noted for its healthfulness.” By 1854, the seminary had graduated more than 200 students, more than seventy of whom had gone to work as teachers throughout the nation. In 1854 alone, the student body numbered 185, with at least ninety from Washington County. The seminary's growth paralleled that of the town.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Table 3; “Trustees,” 50; Gregg, 21; Martha Grayson, “Tributary Offering,” in Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 37; Gamble, 42-43; Letter from Washington Female Seminary Board of Trustees to Sarah R. Hanna, March 28, 1874, in Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 3-4; Harriet K. Branton, “Sarah Foster Hanna and the Washington Female Seminary,” *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 61, no. 3 (July 1978), 224-225, <http://journals.psu.edu/index.php/wph/issue/view/361> (accessed May 14, 2014); W&J, *Catalogue*, 264, 267; Wills, 19, 22; Reed, 16.

¹⁰⁴ Table 3; Washington Female Seminary, *Catalogue of the Officers and Pupils of the Washington Female Seminary, for the Academic Year, Commencing November 1853, and Ending September 1854, together with Conditions of Admittance, &c* (Washington, PA: Reporter Office, 1854), 5-11, 13-18, 23, Internet Archive, <http://archive.org/stream/catalogueofoffic00wash#page/16/mode/2up> (accessed August 17, 2013).

In 1874, the school held a retirement ceremony for Sarah Foster Hanna, who had been the principal for more than thirty years. A graduate of the Troy seminary, Hanna was a formidable figure who would have been unlikely to tolerate any colonizationist-radical abolitionist dissension. As Charlotte LeMoyne Wills recalled, the woman known before her marriage as “Major Foster” carefully “watched over the girls committed to her care. She charged upon and routed the forces of the enemy, in the persons of the boys and college youths who often attempted to open communication with her camp, skirmish around her outposts and scale her defenses.” Hanna shocked and delighted John Quincy Adams by greeting him publicly—a breach of contemporary protocol—on the occasion of the former president’s visit to Washington in 1843. Under Hanna, the seminary had blossomed. Her retirement was a blow to students, alumnae and the community. The retirement ceremony, officially called a “commemorative and farewell reunion,” showed how tightly knit the town remained. The organizers included alumnae from the LeMoyne, McKennan, and Grayson families—daughters of the anti-slavery rivals who had worked together during the 1830s to raise the school.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ Wills, 23; Branton, 222-224, 229; List of Sarah R. Hanna retirement event organizers, in Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 5-6.

Chapter 6: Cooperation in Business and Banking

Collaboration on Washington College and Washington Female Seminary was not an anomaly for Washington County's colonizationists and radical abolitionists; it was a continuation of the civic commitment they and their families had demonstrated since the founding of the county and town. Absalom Baird, patriarch of the Baird clan, was elected justice of the peace in 1789, state senator in 1794 and county sheriff in 1799. William McKennan, the father of T.M.T. McKennan, was elected county prothonotary and clerk of courts in 1803 and justice of the peace in 1804. Joseph Ritner was elected to the state House in 1821, while Joseph Henderson was elected county clerk of courts in 1823, sheriff in 1829 and state representative in 1832. Isaac Leet was county treasurer from 1826 to 1830 and deputy attorney general from 1830 to 1834. Joseph Lawrence was elected to the state House in 1818 and to Congress in 1824. These men and their peers also rotated in and out of town offices. Upon Washington's incorporation in 1810, Alexander Reed became chief burgess. His name is on early legislation specifying the minimum width of sidewalks and ordering the paving of Main Street. Daniel Moore, the uncle of Isaac Leet, served as burgess in 1814. Alexander Reed held the post again in 1816.¹⁰⁶

These families also helped to construct the community's infrastructure. Absalom Baird helped plan the town's first market house, which opened in summer 1795. By 1815, the community had outgrown the structure, and Thomas Baird's business partners, Parker Campbell

¹⁰⁶ Creigh, 251-254, 256, 258, 268; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 252n6, 497-499; Boyd Crumrine, *The Courts of Justice Bench and Bar of Washington County, Pennsylvania: With Sketches of the Early Court-Houses, the Judicial System, the Law Judges, and the Roll of Attorneys of that County; and a History of the Erection and Dedication of the Court-House of 1900* (Chicago: The Lakeside Press, R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1902), 280, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/courtsofjusticeb00crum> (accessed January 30, 2015); G.O. Seilhamer, *The Bard Family: A History and Genealogy of the Bards of "Carroll's Delight" together with a Chronicle of the Bards and Genealogies of the Bard Kinship* (Chambersburg, PA: Kittochtinny Press, 1908), 66, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/stream/bardfamilyhistor00inseil#page/n9/mode/2up> (accessed August 1, 2014).

and Thomas McGiffin, were part of a committee established to oversee construction of a new one. The contract was let to Colonel James Ruple, father of James B. Ruple, who would be one of those involved in disrupting Samuel Gould's June 1836 anti-slavery address at Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Washington. When the market house opened in 1817, Thomas Baird rented two of the rooms himself, John Grayson rented one for his newspaper, the *Washington Examiner*, and Reverend Matthew Brown was involved in renting one for an early girls' school. Thomas Baird received a contract to renovate the county courthouse in 1819—he was president judge by this time—and James McCoy received a contract to do iron work at the new jail in 1825. The capacity of the jail was a matter of contention, with T.M.T. McKennan, Alexander Reed, William Hunter, Samuel Hazlett and Thomas McCall among more than 200 citizens who signed petitions demanding a structure larger than originally proposed. Town fathers turned out to fight fires, too. F.J. LeMoyne, T.M.T. McKennan, Samuel Murdoch, Alexander Reed and Jacob Slagle all held positions such as “engineer,” “captain of the water company” and “captain of the property guard” in 1820s fire departments. Town elites likewise joined forces on early railroad and turnpike projects, mingling civic and personal interests in ways that linked one man to another and each man's prosperity to the town's.¹⁰⁷

The National Road—linking Cumberland, Maryland, and Wheeling, Virginia—loomed large in that prosperity. In 1817 and 1819, Baird, McGiffin and Campbell landed federal contracts to build the National Road across Washington County. They managed the work and hired subcontractors to do the labor. Congressman T.M.T. McKennan was an early supporter of

¹⁰⁷ The population of the town of Washington increased from 1,301 in 1810 to 7,063 in 1900. The county's population increased from 36,289 to 92,180 during the same period. Beers, 1:19; Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 466, 499-502; Crumrine, “Internal Improvements,” in *History of Washington County*, 382-384, 393; Joseph F. McFarland, *20th Century History of the City of Washington and Washington County, Pennsylvania, and Representative Citizens* (Chicago: Richmond-Arnold Publishing, 1916), 1: 125, 456, 458, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/stream/20thcenturyhisto01mcfa#page/n5/mode/2up> (accessed February 8, 2015).

the road and, in the 1830s, he fought for federal funds to repair it. In an address to the House on June 6, 1832, McKennan said, “This road, Mr. Speaker (The National Road), is a *magnificent one—magnificent in extent*; it traverses seven different states of the union and its whole distance will cover an extent of near eight hundred miles ... It is, sir, *a splendid monument of national wealth and national greatness, and of the deep interest felt by the government in the wealth and happiness and prosperity of the people.*” The road was so expansive, he said, that it helped to “cement the bonds of union” and foster national growth. Colonizationists Daniel Moore, who operated a stage line on the road, and George Wilson, who operated a store in the western part of the county during the road’s construction, benefitted financially. So did local companies that made money from maintaining it. With the road’s opening, Margaret McCulloch said, “a flood of travel poured over it ... Innumerable droves of horses, cattle and sheep passed through, grunting and squealing, bleating and lowing as they went. Four-horse coaches with passengers sitting stiffly within went rumbling through, stopping at times to draw up with a clatter before one or another of the taverns.”¹⁰⁸

Banking also played an early role in the town’s development. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, some western Pennsylvanians blamed the Second Bank of the United States and local banks for contributing to economic distress, the former by constricting credit and the latter by circulating unstable currency. Yet enough citizens saw the value of a bank that the county during the early republican period seldom was without one. At first, Washington had only a branch—an “Office of Discount and Deposit”—of the Bank of Philadelphia. The first officers

¹⁰⁸ Boyd Crumrine, “Donegal Township,” in *History of Washington County*, 754; Crumrine, *The Courts of Justice*, 280; McCulloch, 40-41; “To Road Contractors,” *Washington Examiner*, July 19, 1836; Thomas B. Searight, *The Old Pike: A History of the National Road with Incidents, Accidents, and Anecdotes Thereon* (Uniontown, PA: Published by the author, 1894), 15, 176-177, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/oldpikeahistory00searigoog> (accessed August 7, 2014); McKennan quoted in Searight, 107-108. Emphasis in McKennan’s quote as published in Searight.

of the branch included Alexander Reed, Daniel Moore, Alexander Murdoch and Robert Hazlett, the father of Samuel Hazlett, whose family was to have a long future with banking.¹⁰⁹

In late 1813 and early 1814, a group of citizens—including Thomas H. Baird, George Baird, Daniel Leet and Samuel Murdoch—began making plans to establish a bank the town could call its own. The Legislature approved the creation of the Bank of Washington with a capitalization of \$150,000 to \$200,000. The founders opened books for the sale of stock, and the shares, selling for \$50 each, had no shortage of takers. By June 1814, 267 people collectively had purchased more than 5,000 shares, evidently exceeding the authorized capitalization. The purchasers included William Baird (six shares), Thomas H. Baird (thirty shares), Thomas McCall (seventy-five shares), Joseph Ritner (two shares), Samuel Murdoch (fifty shares) and various members of the Hazlett family (together, more than 300 shares). The list also included dozens of ordinary citizens who aren't otherwise mentioned in county histories. With the stock sold and other preliminary requirements satisfied, Governor Simon Snyder approved the bank's charter on July 5, 1814.¹¹⁰

No record of the bank's loans appears to have survived. However, it would not be surprising if the bank were organized, and loans made, along the lines that Naomi R. Lamoreaux has documented in New England. Lamoreaux found that early banks in the region functioned largely as capital generators for influential kinship networks. These extended families founded the banks, bought much of the initial stock and controlled the boards of directors for years, if not decades, at a stretch. They also loaned themselves much of the banks' capital, in some cases

¹⁰⁹ Creigh, 197-198; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 486-487, 524-525; John F. Hellegers, "Some Bases of Early Pro-Jackson Sentiment in Western Pennsylvania," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 45, no. 1 (March 1962), 33-35, <http://journals.psu.edu/index.php/wph/article/view/1917> (accessed May 20, 2014); "Little v. Hazlett," in *Atlantic Reporter* 47 (September 5, 1900-February 13, 1901), 856-857, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=DN4KAAAAYAAJ> (accessed August 2, 2014).

¹¹⁰ Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 525-526; Charter and list of subscribers, Bank of Washington, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg, PA, Record Group 26, Records of the Department of State.

leaving little for outsiders to borrow. In Washington's case, the bank was founded by business elites who saw it as a mechanism for fueling the town's growth and advancing their own fortunes. The bank's biggest proponents included the Hazletts, who came to establish a private banking house, and the Bairs, who had various business interests and seemed perpetually in need of money. Thomas H. Baird was the first president of the bank's board of directors. When he became the county's president judge in January 1819, he resigned from the bank, only to be succeeded on the board by his brother, George—illustrating the kind of kinship control that Lamoreaux documented in New England. John F. Hellegers said the bank “appears to have been fairly sound in comparison with most other local banks in Western Pennsylvania,” but it is difficult to see how that could have been the case. The bank foundered as early as 1818 and briefly lost its charter—bad loans, currency devaluations, mismanagement, thievery and the economic downturn following the War of 1812 all could have been to blame—but the institution limped on until at least 1834.¹¹¹

About the time he resigned from the board—and as the directors considered closing the bank for good—Thomas Baird tried to tidy his affairs. He owed the bank \$16,000 on a note his brother had cosigned. He was obligated for a \$3,000 loan he had cosigned for someone else. And he and George together owed another \$1,000. To pay off the debts, Thomas Baird offered the bank a mortgage on a steam mill he owned. The directors accepted the offer. George Baird attended that meeting, but it is not known how, or whether, he voted. The deal proved unpopular with shareholders, however, and directors eventually voted six to one to discharge the debts for

¹¹¹ Hellegers, 32-34; Creigh, 197-199; Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 525-526; Letter from Thomas H. Baird to Robert R. Reed, October 22, 1842, Papers of the Reed Family, MSS#135, Folder 2, HSWP Archives; Naomi R. Lamoreaux, “Banks, Kinship and Economic Development: The New England Case,” *Journal of Economic History* 46, no. 3 (September 1986), 650-654, www.jstor.org/stable/2121478 (accessed August 6, 2014); “Baird against the Bank of Washington,” in *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania* 11, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Kay and Brother, 1876), 411-412, Google Books, books.google.com/books?id=9GAtAQAAAJ (accessed May 21, 2014).

other property the judge offered. George Baird voted with the majority on that occasion, again illustrating the kind of nepotism that Lamoreaux documented in New England. Unhappy shareholders filed suit, claiming that George Baird's vote was invalid, but the state Supreme Court in 1824 sided with the Bairs and ordered a new trial.¹¹²

While that case unfolded, bank directors found themselves in another dispute about the foundering institution's finances. The bank sued its cashier, John Barrington, alleging that he had committed nearly forty errors or fraudulent acts involving the disposition of stock and funds. Some of the alleged infractions involved Thomas Baird and George Baird. One court document said of Barrington, "He has credited the stock account of Thomas H. Baird with fifty-two shares of stock, the property of other persons, some of whom are deceased ..." Along with Barrington, the bank sued Daniel Moore and John Hughes, who were obligors on a \$30,000 surety for the cashier's work. The bank wanted the \$30,000, or some portion of it, as damages for Barrington's performance. But the legitimacy of the bond fell into question. Robert Hazlett had been an obligor, too. But his name had been removed from surety documents under mysterious circumstances. When or how the change occurred, nobody could establish. But the remaining obligors, evidently not party to the change, claimed that the surety had been rendered invalid. A jury found in the bank's favor, but the state Supreme Court ordered a new trial.¹¹³

¹¹² Court records do not say what property Thomas Baird offered in place of the steam mill. George Baird replaced his brother on the board of directors but did not succeed him as president of the bank. In filing suit, the plaintiffs claimed that George Baird's appointment to the board was invalid because an insufficient number of trustees had been present to vote on filling the vacancy. The outcome of the new trial, ordered by the state Supreme Court, is not known. "Baird against the Bank of Washington," 412-414, 418.

¹¹³ Because of Thomas Baird's involvement in the case, a visiting judge handled the initial county trial. The outcome of the second trial, ordered by the state Supreme Court, is not known. "Barrington and Others against the Bank of Washington," in *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania* 14, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Kay and Brother, 1874), 405-407, 409-412, 415, 426, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=GPrzAAAAMAAJ> (accessed May 22, 2014).

Although the Bank of Washington was a rollercoaster venture and dragged the town's leading citizens into at least two legal quagmires, they continued to collaborate on community-development initiatives. And if their relationship survived bank scandals, why could it not also survive a disagreement about slavery? As they revived Washington College and established Washington Female Seminary, immediatists and colonizationists also embarked on new business and infrastructure ventures in the 1830s.

In 1836, for example, abolitionist Ephraim Estep and colonizationist Daniel Moore joined with businessmen from Allegheny, Armstrong, Fayette, Greene, Somerset and Westmoreland counties to establish a Monongahela Labor Academy on a ten-acre plot in Williamsport. Legislation creating the school authorized the sale of products grown by the students but offered no other details about the type of instruction to be offered there. The academy does not seem to have gotten off the ground. In 1837, radical abolitionist Samuel Hazlett and at least six colonizationists were part of a group that re-incorporated the Washington and Pittsburg [sic] Railroad Company. The project stalled, as it did under an initial charter granted in 1831, and the line was not built.¹¹⁴ More successful was the Washington Mutual Insurance Company, formed in 1837 by a group that included Samuel Hazlett and at least eight colonizationists.¹¹⁵ The charter made stockholders jointly liable for claims, reinforcing their ties to each other and the town.

¹¹⁴ Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, "An Act to Incorporate the Monongahela Labor Academy at Williamsport," in *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1835-36, in the Sixtieth Year of Independence*, hereafter Laws, 1835-1836 (Harrisburg: Theo: Fenn, 1836), 232-233; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, "An Act to Incorporate the Washington and Pittsburg [sic] Railroad Co.," in *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1836-37, in the Sixty-First Year of Independence*, hereafter Laws, 1836-1837 (Harrisburg: Theo: Fenn, 1837), 137-138, 143-144; Crumrine, "Internal Improvements," 393-394. The colonizationists involved in the railroad were Daniel Moore, William Hunter, Alexander Reed, John Wishart, William Smith and Samuel Murdoch.

¹¹⁵ The colonizationists involved in the formation of the insurance company were William Hunter, Thomas McGiffin, T.M.T. McKennan, Daniel Moore, Samuel Murdoch, Alexander Reed, Jacob Slagle and William Smith. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, "An Act Supplementary to the Act Entitled 'An Act Authorizing the Governor to Incorporate the Wallenpaupack Improvement Co., and for Other Purposes,'" hereafter Washington County Mutual Insurance Company charter, in Laws, 1836-1837, 156; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 528.

Authorized to insure houses, shops, furniture and merchandise, among other items, the company was another sign of the community's growing prosperity. The company got off to a slow start—writing its first policy in 1848—but it was still in business as late as the 1880s. By that time, its initial charter and a twenty-year extension had expired, and a new charter had been obtained under the name Washington County Fire Insurance Company. Its officers over the years included Hazlett; John Grayson; Grayson's son, John; Alexander Reed's son, Colin; and F.J. LeMoyne's son-in-law, Vachel Harding.¹¹⁶

Their need for capital unfulfilled, civic leaders embarked in 1836 on what may have been their most ambitious entrepreneurial venture of the decade—creation of a new bank, the Franklin Bank of Washington. The Legislature authorized a capitalization of \$300,000 and placed organization of the bank in the hands of thirty-two commissioners, a group that included at least six radical abolitionists and at least eleven colonizationists.¹¹⁷ Letters and articles in the *Washington Examiner* stressed the community-minded nature of the enterprise. In July 1836, an unidentified commissioner wrote the paper to warn that a “gentleman of New York” and some associates were interested in acquiring a majority of the outstanding stock. The bank, he said, was a cause “of much importance to our town and county. Let, then, our own citizens come forward and, while they yet have the chance, become the owners of the stock themselves.” Within two months, another letter writer urged those who had not gotten on board to do so quickly. “A hint to the wise is sufficient,” the writer said, noting that “most of the stock is already sold and has gone into the hands of some of our most thrifty and substantial citizens.”

¹¹⁶ Washington County Mutual Insurance Company charter, 156, 159; Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 528.

¹¹⁷ The commissioners included radical abolitionists F.J. LeMoyne, Alexander Sweney, Joseph Henderson, Samuel Mount, Samuel McFarland and John S. Brady and colonizationists George Wilson, Aaron Fenton, Alexander Reed, William Smith, T.M.T. McKennan, Jacob Slagle, Samuel Murdoch, Daniel Moore, William Hunter, Thomas McCall and Thomas McGiffin. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, “An Act to Incorporate the Franklin Bank of Washington,” in Laws, 1835-1836, 68-69; Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 526-527.

Later that month, the paper gave another update: “About 1,200 shares of the Franklin Bank were sold on Wednesday last in this place. The whole 4,000 shares has been sold.” All but about 200 shares, the paper added, went to county residents.¹¹⁸

The list of subscribers is impressive both for the number who bought shares and for some families’ level of investment, despite what must have been lingering concerns about the banking environment. F.J. LeMoyne bought 120 shares, which cost \$50 each. Joseph Henderson bought 100 shares, T.M.T. McKennan thirty-five and John S. Brady twenty. With 100 shares, Washington College was among the larger subscribers. The college’s investment, engineered no doubt by trustees simultaneously involved in the bank’s creation, underscored the interdependence of the town’s institutions and leading families. That is why collaboration on the bank proceeded apace throughout the summer of 1836, despite the tension over radical abolitionism. The August 6, 1836, issue of the *Examiner* both urged support for the Franklin Bank and rebuked Samuel Gould, whom publisher John Grayson, a colonizationist, called a “very impudent man, if not in a very great degree regardless of the public peace, which has in so many places been violated because of his own immediate instrumentality.” Of course, Gould was an outsider, not one of the local immediatists enmeshed in a web of social and civic ties with Grayson.¹¹⁹

By September 1836, shareholders had elected the inaugural thirteen-member board of directors, a contingent that included at least one radical abolitionist and at least six

¹¹⁸ “Franklin Bank,” *Washington Examiner*, July 30, 1836; “Synopsis of the Principal Provisions of the Charter of the Franklin Bank of Washington,” *Washington Examiner*, August 6, 1836; “Take Notice,” *Washington Examiner*, August 13, 1836.

¹¹⁹ Table 4 lists the known colonizationists and radical abolitionists who were inaugural investors in the Franklin Bank of Washington. Charter and list of subscribers, Franklin Bank of Washington, Pennsylvania State Archives, Record Group 26, Records of the Department of State; John Grayson, “The Commotion at Williamsport,” August 6, 1836; “Synopsis of the Principal Provisions of the Charter of the Franklin Bank of Washington,” August 6, 1836.

colonizationists.¹²⁰ Alexander Reed served as bank president until his death in 1842, and T.M.T McKennan held the position from 1843 until his death in 1852. At that point, Colin M. Reed, Alexander's son, took over. The pattern of leadership continued in the way Lamoreaux described in New England. In 1865, the institution was reorganized as First National Bank of Washington with many of the same community leaders, including John S. Brady, Joseph Henderson, Colin Reed and Jacob Slagle, continuing as directors of the institution.¹²¹

The Bairds were not among the Franklin Bank's inaugural shareholders or directors. Their financial problems continued throughout the 1830s and into the 1850s as Thomas H. Baird pursued the family's claim for back war pay purportedly owed to the family patriarch. Absalom Baird, who had been a surgeon in the Revolution before settling in Washington about 1786, claimed that the federal government owed him thousands of dollars for his service. The doctor pressed his case with Congress, without result. Then, in 1805, "Dr. Baird was killed by a fall from his horse," according to court records. "In consequence of some liabilities incurred in a commercial business, his affairs were embarrassed, and his whole property, real and personal, was sold to satisfy his creditors. The sacrifice was enormous."¹²²

In 1818, thirteen years after his father's death, Thomas Baird renewed the family's claim for Absalom Baird's back pay. The government paid \$2,400 in 1836, but the Bairds refused to give up, saying they were owed \$16,000 more. At one point, about fifty of the Bairds' friends in

¹²⁰ The radical abolitionist was John S. Brady, and the colonizationists were Aaron Fenton, William Hunter, Thomas McCall, Daniel Moore, Samuel Murdoch and Alexander Reed. "Franklin Bank of Washington," *Washington Examiner*, September 17, 1836. Crumrine and Creigh also listed colonizationist George Wilson as a bank director, but the *Washington Examiner* did not.

¹²¹ Creigh, 198-199; "Washington Borough," 526-527; Reed, 25; Beers, 1:191.

¹²² "Thomas H. Baird vs. The United States," in *Reports from the Court of Claims, Submitted to the House of Representatives, during the First Session of the Thirty-Fourth Congress: 1855-'56*, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Cornelius Wendell, 1856), 1-2, 11, 27, 49, 67-69, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=hZQKAQAAMAAJ> (accessed May 28, 2014). It is not clear whether this title was published by Congress or the Court of Claims.

Washington County sent a letter to Congress seeking a favorable disposition of the family's case: "We have long known them as conspicuous and active participators in most of the useful enterprises of the present age for public utility and national improvement—as citizens of our town and county, public-spirited and benevolent." A just settlement of their claim, the letter added, "would coincide with the earnest wishes of this entire community." The letter was not dated. However, it may have been written in the spring of 1833, given a reference to the burning of Baird's steam mill "during the last year." In all, the signers included at least five men who were radical abolitionists and at least eight who were colonizationists during the 1830s. The letter, written when the conflict between colonization and radical abolitionism was on the horizon if not already at hand in southwestern Pennsylvania, was another example of community leaders banding together for the stability of their community.¹²³

By 1902, the town had no fewer than five banks, and the Baird name had resurfaced in at least one of them. W.A. Baird, the grandson of George Baird and great-grandson of Abaslom, was assistant secretary/treasurer of Washington Trust Company, which the Pittsburgh business periodical *Money* described as a "strong institution" owning the "most ornamental business building in the city." Other familiar names also continued to dominate the banking scene. John W. Donnan, grandson of the radical abolitionist Alexander Donnan, was president of Washington Trust Company and Citizens National Bank. His brother, Alvin, was a director of Citizens National. The directors of Union Trust Company included Julius LeMoyne, F.J. LeMoyne's son, and C.V. Harding, the radical abolitionist's grandson. First National, the

¹²³ Crumrine dated the fire as occurring in 1832, while historian Joseph F. McFarland said it occurred in 1831. The radical abolitionists who signed the letter were John S. Brady, Joseph Henderson, Robert Lattimer, James McCoy, and Alexander Sweeney, and the colonizationists who signed were W.P. Alrich, John L. Gow, Reverend Thomas Hoge, John Grayson, Isaac Leet, Daniel Moore, Alexander Reed and John Wishart. Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 542; "Thomas H. Baird vs. The United States," 2, 16-17; Joseph F. McFarland, 1: 467.

successor of Franklin Bank, remained in business with Colin M. Reed Jr.—Colin Reed’s son and Alexander’s grandson—as vice president. *Money* called it “one of the oldest banks west of the Alleghenies.” The magazine said the town also had a “promising” institution in the new Real Estate Trust Company, of which Thomas McKennan Smith, the great-grandson of T.M.T. McKennan, was a director. When Smith died in 1948, his obituary lauded him as “one of the wealthiest men in western Pennsylvania and a member of a prominent pioneer family” who had made his fortune in oil, gas, land and banking. Smith and his contemporaries expanded their families’ legacy of collaboration, entrepreneurship and service in a community that had sustained them for generations.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Table 2; Baird genealogy, Ancestry.com, <http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/BAIRD/1999-03/0922286236> (accessed July 26, 2014); Boyd Crumrine, “Mount Pleasant Township,” in *History of Washington County*, 864-865; W&J, *Catalogue*, 396, 428, 435, 466; Beers, 1:191; “William McKennan Smith Dies in Washington, PA: Wealthy Member of Pioneer Family was 80; Made Money in Gas, Oil, Other Ventures,” *The Pittsburgh Press*, Pittsburgh, PA., October 17, 1948, Google Newspapers, <http://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1144&dat=19481017&id=Dz4bAAAAIIBAJ&sjid=Mk0EAAAAIIBAJ&pg=2673.591252> (accessed May 28, 2014); “Washington,” *Money*, Pittsburgh, PA, September 20, 1902, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=588cAQAAMAAJ> (accessed May 28, 2014).

Conclusion: Slavery and the Hierarchy of Community Values

While the resuscitation of Washington College, founding of Washington Female Seminary and establishment of Franklin Bank may have been their signature collaborations, Washington County's colonizationists and radical abolitionists worked together on many other fronts during the 1830s. All of these endeavors protected or advanced the interests of the town or county, which, in turn, served the participants' personal interests. In summer 1834, radical abolitionists R.F. Biddle, Richard Curran, Samuel McFarland and William Hamilton and colonizationists R.H. Lee, Isaac Leet, W.K. McDonald and Robert R. Reed were among the founders of a Young Men's Society, which aimed for the community's moral and intellectual improvement. McFarland, Robert R. Reed and numerous other immediatists and colonizationists also were active in the Washington County Society for the Promotion of Agricultural and Domestic Manufactures, which awarded premiums for the finest stallions, brood mares, colts, cows, calves, yearlings, swine, sheep and implements. In addition, colonizationists and radical abolitionists collaborated in a Washington College alumni group and in a Temperance Society, with the *Washington Examiner* noting in one issue that temperance "has lost none of its importance since it was first introduced to the public attention."¹²⁵

Community celebrations—from college and seminary commencements to Independence Day festivities—may have been poignant reminders of the nation's republican experiment and of the many interests that united the groups despite their differences over slavery. On June 7, 1834, for example, the *Examiner* published—on the same page—a story about the reorganization of the

¹²⁵ "Young Men's Society," *Washington Examiner*, June 28, 1834; "Agricultural," *Washington Examiner*, July 12, 1834; "Alumni Meeting," *Washington Examiner*, September 10, 1835; "Temperance Society," *Washington Examiner*, November 5, 1836.

county Colonization Society and a notice about Washington's upcoming Independence Day celebration. By this time, the radical abolitionists must have been making plans for their own organization, yet immediatist Joseph Henderson joined colonizationists, including William Baird and R.H. Lee, in the holiday preparations. Henderson chaired the committee on arrangements, and Baird was asked to give an oration. Lee was appointed to read the Declaration of Independence. This was not a one-time display of unity. In the summer of 1836, just weeks after the furor involving Samuel Gould, radical abolitionist John S. Brady and colonizationist William Jack served on a committee planning a "grand military parade" in Washington.¹²⁶

Colonizationists and radical abolitionists also mobilized collectively when the threat of a cholera epidemic gripped Washington during the summer of 1834. Within a few days, an infant, two other children, two women and a "German Emigrant, name not known" had died. Three of those killed were related to Robert McGee, a resident who had been exposed to the disease in nearby Wheeling, Virginia. But the source of transmission was not clear. One newspaper article noted that the McGees lived in a part of town that was "in some respects unhealthy." T.M.T. McKennan took charge of a Board of Health, which created "committees of inspection" and directed them to "make an immediate minute examination of their respective wards, report all nuisances ... and adopt such measures for their removal as they may deem necessary." The committee for the "South West Ward" included radical abolitionists Joseph Henderson and George K. Scott and colonizationists Daniel Moore and Jacob Slagle. The board ordered the borough's doctors—including F.J. LeMoyne, Samuel Murdoch and John Wishart—to furnish a report "as to the nature and symptoms" of cholera and provide advice to the worried citizenry. In a statement published in the *Examiner*, town officials said, "The public may rest assured that the

¹²⁶ "Public Meeting" and "Arrangement for Celebrating the 4th of July," *Washington Examiner*, June 7, 1834; "Grand Military Parade," *Washington Examiner*, July 30, 1836.

Board of Health will give a faithful report of all the cases which may occur in town. Lime will be furnished to the citizens, and they are required to use this infallible purifier liberally.”¹²⁷

Colonizationists and radical abolitionists even lined up together on opposite sides of one controversial issue. In 1835, residents and property owners of Williamsport and other southeastern communities tried to secede from the county, claiming their distance from the county seat had relegated them to a commercial backwater. The would-be secessionists included radical abolitionist R.F. Biddle and colonizationist Thomas H. Baird, who owned property in Williamsport. Residents of central and western areas of the county banded together to prevent the county’s fragmentation. Radical abolitionists Samuel Hazlett, Robert Lattimer, F.J. LeMoyne, and Alexander Sweney and colonizationists Daniel Moore, Alexander Reed and Jacob Slagle were among those who called a meeting in November 1835 to organize the opposition to secession. Citizens from southeastern communities might have had more convenience and influence in a new county, but residents in the Washington area put their own interests first. During the November 19 public meeting, at which Moore served as president and Sweney vice president, participants expressed concern that the loss of southeastern communities would diminish Washington County’s power in the state and “benefit the few at the expense of the many.” After details of the gathering appeared in the Washington newspaper *Our Country*, an anonymous letter writer pointed out that “the persons who figured in the meeting were all citizens of the borough of Washington,” for whom the seat of government was “conveniently situated for their interests. They are therefore ready to kick against those who dare to interfere with their prescriptive right to have all the business of the county flow to their stores and shops. This is an offense to them. They cannot believe that a slovenly, unhandsome village

¹²⁷ “Cholera!” “Health of the Borough” and “Board of Health,” *Washington Examiner*, July 26, 1834.

[Williamsport] should rise to importance and rival their ancient town.” He added that the people of Williamsport would “not be driven from their course either by the pride of fancied rank or the impudence of wealth.” Although hyperbolic, the letter writer understood the landscape. The people of central and western Washington County acted in concert to safeguard shared interests, even if they disagreed on other matters. The secession attempt failed.¹²⁸

Family ties further bound some of the county’s colonizationists and radical abolitionists. The intergenerational connections between the LeMoyne and Reed families already have been noted. In addition, Samuel Hazlett’s sister, Jane, married John Wishart’s brother, James. William Hamilton, a radical abolitionist and missionary, married Julia McGiffin, the daughter of colonizationist Thomas McGiffin. The families of Governor Joseph Ritner and Alexander Reed were united by loss. On November 11, 1835, Reed’s son, Colin, married Mary Kyle Ritner, the widow of Ritner’s son, Joseph, who had been an Army officer and a Washington College professor. The wedding occurred in the governor’s Washington home. Mary died two years later, leaving a daughter to be raised by the Reed family. It is difficult to imagine slavery alienating the Reed and Ritner clans.¹²⁹

Nor did slavery necessarily upend Washington County political alliances. When Judge Thomas H. Baird in 1836 raised the possibility of resigning from the bench, radical abolitionist Joseph Henderson was part of a sizable group of county residents that tried to dissuade him.

¹²⁸ “New County Meeting,” *Our Country*, November 5, 1835; “Public Meeting,” *Our Country*, November 12, 1835; “Public Meeting,” *Our Country*, November 19, 1835; “Communicated,” *Our Country*, December 2, 1835; Beers, 1:153.

¹²⁹ Reed, 16, 25; W&J, *Catalogue*, 268, 291-292; Table 2; Table 3; William Hamilton, “Autobiography of William Hamilton,” in *Transactions and Reports of the Nebraska State Historical Society*, Vol. 1, ed. Robert W. Furnas (Lincoln, NE: State Journal Co., 1885), 62, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=S5sUAAAAYAAJ> (accessed September 8, 2014); Warner, Beers & Co., *History of Cumberland and Adams Counties, Pennsylvania: Containing History of the Counties, their Townships, Towns, Villages, Churches, Industries, Etc.; Portraits of Early Settlers and Prominent Men; Biographies; History of Pennsylvania, Statistical and Miscellaneous Matter, Etc., Etc.* (Chicago: Warner, Beers & Co., 1886), 586-587, Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=pcwwAQAAAJ&source=gb_s_navlinks_s (accessed March 12, 2015).

When Baird in fact resigned in 1837, eleven friends of colonizationist T.M.T. McKennan wrote him a letter urging him to seek the vacancy. The writers included radical abolitionists William Cornwell and Samuel McFarland and colonizationists John L. Gow and R.H. Lee. To press the point, McFarland followed up with his own private letter two days later. Noting that Ritner had the power of appointment, McKennan's friends assured him that the job was his for the asking. Yet McKennan does not appear to have been interested. In the end, Ritner appointed Nathaniel Ewing, a Fayette County resident and colonizationist. Cornwell did not let McKennan off the hook. When McKennan in 1837 made noises about leaving Congress, Cornwell implored him to seek another term. He feared that if the Antimason McKennan stepped down, the seat would go to someone in another party, probably a Democrat. Evidently, Democrats troubled Cornwell more than colonizationists did.¹³⁰

All in all, however, political party differences did not seem to separate town and county leaders any more than slavery did. The Second American Party System of Democrats and Whigs coalesced during the 1830s, and according to Harry L. Watson, citizens "chose a party loyalty early and tended to stick with it, usually voting the same way, year after year, in local, state and federal elections." However, Watson also acknowledged a certain blurring of party ideology and loyalty at the grassroots level because of each community's unique needs and characteristics.¹³¹

In this milieu, various alliances were possible. Antimasons such as Joseph Ritner, Thomas McGiffin, Joseph Lawrence and T.M.T. McKennan worked with Alexander Reed, a prominent Mason, and John Grayson, a Democrat who worked for William Duane—editor of the

¹³⁰ McKennan was succeeded in Congress by Isaac Leet, a colonizationist and Democrat. "Pennsylvania Union Convention"; Creigh, 255; "Great Public Meeting," *Washington Examiner*, April 9, 1836; Letter to T.M.T. McKennan from eleven friends, December 25, 1837, letter to T.M.T. McKennan from Samuel McFarland, December 27, 1837, and letter to T.M.T. McKennan from William Cornwell, April 18, 1838, WCHS Archives, Box A-12, Folder 4; Joseph F. McFarland, 1:148-149, 153, 159.

¹³¹ Harry L. Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America*, 2nd ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006), 199, 233-235.

party organ *Aurora* in Philadelphia—before settling in Washington. All of these Washington elites worked with F.J. LeMoynes, who appears to have had no political affiliation before his Liberty Party activism in the 1840s. McKennan, Lawrence and Reed eventually joined the Whigs. Grayson may have been among those whose politics were partly influenced by local conditions; the Democrat’s newspaper, the *Washington Examiner*, was “remarkably” Whig-like. Whigs may have been the party of improvement, but town and county leaders of various political stripes saw a need to move their community forward.¹³²

Although the county’s colonizationists and radical abolitionists had many reasons to work together, the question may be asked: Did they forge a path to collaboration—did they get along—because they differed in some material way from counterparts who were assailing each other verbally and physically at the national and state levels? Did they soft-pedal their ideologies or constrain their advocacy? Were they closer in social standing than immediatists and colonizationists in other parts of the country and, if so, did class solidarity help to paper over slavery-related disagreements? The answer to all of these questions is no.

In fact, the opposite was true. The county’s colonizationists and radical abolitionists collaborated on the college, seminary, bank and other fronts while aggressively working to advance their respective positions on bondage. In August 1834, the county Colonization Society published an address in the *Washington Examiner* describing colonization both as the best hope for free blacks and a way to win the emancipation of Southern slaves. The address lauded the condition of settlements in Liberia and asserted that the colonies already had helped to diminish the slave trade. In another newspaper article, the county colonizationists declared fealty to their

¹³² The *Washington Reporter* and the Washington newspaper *Our Country* also were Democratic, perhaps reflecting the fact that the town, while growing, still had a large rural base. Table 4; “Mr. McGiffin,” *Washington Examiner*, March 12, 1836; Crumrine, “Washington Borough,” 488, 508; Hellegers, 38-39; McCulloch, 130; Beers, 1: 100, 190; Joseph F. McFarland, 1: 148-149; Watson, 244-245

national organization and suggested that “the ladies of the town and county” form their own auxiliaries with the aim of supporting Liberian schools. The county colonizationists’ work evidently had the respect of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society or Robert R. Reed would not have been elected a vice president of the statewide organization.¹³³

In August 1835, the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society published its own declaration of sentiments. A bold assertion of the radical abolitionist argument, the address took up an entire page. Signed by F.J. LeMoyne, Alexander Sweney and Joseph Templeton, it demanded the “entire abolition of slavery in the United States” and called bondage a grave sin that undercut the American experiment: “It is opposed to the spirit of our Government, makes our national declaration a mere mockery, convicts us of hypocrisy at the bar of the world, neutralizes the power of our example as a nation and checks the progress of republican principles.” The writers rejected the notion of colonization but tried to reassure those uneasy with the immediatist agenda: “By immediate emancipation, we do not mean that the slaves shall be turned loose upon the nation, to roam as vagabonds and aliens: Nor, that they shall be *instantly* invested with all civil rights and privileges.” The radical abolitionists demanded that freedmen only receive legal protection and a fair wage for their labor. The immediatists pledged not to incite slave violence or ask Congress to interfere in the affairs of slave states. Instead, they vowed to work against slavery by prayer; by appealing to slave owners’ hearts, minds and pocketbooks; and by agitating publicly against bondage. The evidence shows that they kept their word. The radical abolitionists’ address, which also called slavery a reproach to God and an insult to free labor, was aligned with the constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society and the principles of other auxiliaries in Pennsylvania and other states. Some of the passages in the

¹³³ “Public Meeting,” June 7, 1834; Appendix to *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll*, 45; “To the People of Washington County,” *Washington Examiner*, August 2, 1834.

address are similar to those used in the constitution of the Oberlin [College] Anti-Slavery Society, an indication that affiliates of the national organization were circulating polemical boilerplate.¹³⁴

If members of the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society were tempted to stray from radical abolitionist doctrine, LeMoyne would have been quick to admonish them. LeMoyne's correspondence shows the unlikelihood of ideological compromise on his part. "Colonization principles harden men's hearts," he declared in an April 1837 letter to Templeton. "We ought to expose it [sic] most thoroughly. I once thought that we might promulgate abolitionism without disturbing colonization. But I find that is idle ... We must exhibit its anti-Christian principles—expose its rotten foundation—correct its misrepresentations—& uproot it from the public mind before the good seed of righteousness & justice & mercy will take firm root & flourish." A decade later, in a letter to Lewis Tappan, LeMoyne denounced an article in the radical abolitionist *National Era* because it suggested compensating owners for the emancipation of slaves. The suggestion conflicted with radical abolitionist doctrine. "Why not write an expostulatory letter to Dr. Bailey," Tappan replied, referring to Gamaliel Bailey, the paper's editor. "I am always grieved when any abolitionist adopts any principle at variance with the foundation principle of our association." Clearly, LeMoyne felt the same.¹³⁵

By 1838, the county Colonization Society had at least fourteen auxiliaries with at least 539 members. The Anti-Slavery Society also operated numerous auxiliaries. Membership data

¹³⁴ *The Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society*, 3, 5, 8; Oberlin Anti-Slavery Society, *Constitution of the Oberlin [College] Anti-Slavery Society*, June 1835, Oberlin College, <http://www.oberlin.edu/external/EOG/Documents/OberlinAntiSlaveryCon.htm> (accessed June 16, 2014); "Address of the Anti-Slavery Society of Washington County to their Fellow Citizens." Emphasis in address in the original.

¹³⁵ LeMoyne's letter to Tappan cannot be found, but the nature of his complaint may be inferred from Tappan's response. Emphasis in LeMoyne's letter to Templeton is in the original. Letter from F. J. LeMoyne to Joseph Templeton, April 6, 1837; Letter from Lewis Tappan to F.J. LeMoyne in F.J. LeMoyne, Lewis Tappan, et al., "Anti-Slavery Letters of Dr. F.J. LeMoyne of Washington, Pennsylvania," *Journal of Negro History* 18, no. 4 (October 1933), 454, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2714305> (accessed June 19, 2014).

for the immediatists are elusive, but Margaret McCulloch said the colonization movement always attracted more members. Whatever their numbers, the county's colonizationists and radical abolitionists backed their sentiments with action. They proselytized, circulated petitions, publicized their meetings in the local newspapers, hosted visits by outside speakers and raised funds for their causes. In May 1836, for example, Elliott Cresson of the Young Men's Colonization Society of Pennsylvania visited Washington County seeking funds to help settle at Bassa Cove 2,000 slaves who, he said, otherwise might be forced to remain in chains. When Cresson had finished speaking, county colonizationists quickly set up an ad hoc fund-raising committee. The abolitionist network was just as committed. Even small anti-slavery auxiliaries, such as the one that James Miller and others established in the southeastern part of the county, raised money and circulated petitions. In one letter to LeMoyne, Miller said, "We will be able in a short time to make a small remittance from our little society towards the liquidation of our state pledges."¹³⁶ Residents of Wheeling accused Washington County immediatists of trying to spread their message there, too. Given Wheeling's proximity to West Middletown, one of Washington County's most active centers of radical abolitionism, the allegation could well have been true.¹³⁷

Though the groups often toiled separately, the battle for public opinion sometimes required them to take the stage together. Throughout the 1830s, immediatists and colonizationists locked horns in public debates, some of which attracted large crowds and were long remembered. In his April 1837 letter to Joseph Templeton, LeMoyne said, "We had a great county debate here a few weeks ago, & the good cause, as it always does when it has free

¹³⁶ "Colonization Meeting," *Washington Examiner*, April 16, 1836; "African Colonization," *May 21, 1836*; "Colonization Proceedings," May 28, 1836; "Anti-Slavery Meeting," *Washington Examiner*, July 2, 1836; Letter from James Miller to F.J. LeMoyne, September 21, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 3; Letter from F.J. LeMoyne, reprinted in *The Friend of Man*, August 4, 1836; American Colonization Society, "Tenth Annual Report," 86; McCulloch, 185; Appendix to the *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll*, 46-47.

¹³⁷ "The Virginia Petitions; Wheeling Meeting; Resolutions and Address of the Petitioners," W&J Archives, Folder xv-j-399. This is a newspaper article, dated January 12, 1839, but the name of the publication is not given.

discussion, gloriously triumphed.” LeMoyne delighted in the stir radical abolitionists everywhere had created. He told Templeton, “This whole nation is roused from her disgraceful, sinful sleep—and the cry is we have wakened them up rudely and they forsooth are in a bad humor. Let it be so. We do not tickle the nose of our neighbor when we rush into his bed room in the dead of night to proclaim to its snoring inmates that their home is on fire!—But we shake them up effectually so that sleep is banished suddenly & the whole family spring to action for their own relief. I need not run the parallel between this nation and such a household.”¹³⁸

Before and after the 1837 debate—actually a series of debates—both sides engaged in a spirited recruitment campaign. In a January 1837 letter to LeMoyne, James Miller said Robert R. Reed and R.H. Lee had promoted colonization at a gathering in the Finleyville area. But the crowd, he said, was “scarcely as large as the one you addressed.”¹³⁹ Miller said Reed and Lee described colonization as a vehicle for exterminating slavery, and Lee predicted that “the South would give up her slaves if she knew what to do with them.” Lee alleged that the “abolitionists retarded the cause of emancipation,” and he dismissed the immediatist position as impractical. At the end of the meeting, members of the audience were invited to join the Colonization Society. “This was acceded to, and some half dozen probably joined,” Miller said. “But all this did not intimidate us. We met on Monday the 16th instant and organized a small society (12 members male and female) at the house of John Huston.” Miller invited LeMoyne to return to the area to give another address.¹⁴⁰ In August, Joseph Mills wrote to LeMoyne with his own request, saying “several of the most respectable citizens of Brownsville and Bridgeport” desired an address by

¹³⁸ McCulloch, 126; Letter from F.J. LeMoyne to Joseph Templeton, April 7, 1837. Emphasis in the original.

¹³⁹ Details of the LeMoyne address that Miller referenced are not known. Letter from James Miller to F.J. LeMoyne, January 18, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 3.

¹⁴⁰ This evidently is the “little society” previously mentioned. Letter from James Miller to F.J. LeMoyne, January 18, 1837.

the anti-slavery society.¹⁴¹ “They feel very anxious, as Judge Baird has been telling some of them a fine tale on the colonization system, and dwelt pretty much on the Bible to prove slavery not only tolerated but common.” A month later, James Miller again asked LeMoyne to visit, saying he had arranged lodging, a pulpit for him to use and local ministers to take him around. Ministers favorable to the radical abolitionist cause must have been few and far between there. Miller said, “Our opponents are so numerous and so well sustained by the clergy and the influential of the people that we can make little head. Our colonization neighbors are very morose. They will neither read nor hear.” He finished his letter with a plea. “Dear doctor, come to Williamsport if you possibly can.”¹⁴²

James Miller’s letter of January 1837 included a rare reference to the county’s female immediatists. LeMoyne’s wife, Madeleine, shared her husband’s sentiments. But there is no record in Washington County of the female auxiliaries or free-produce groups that existed in other Northern locales. About 120 county women did sign a petition demanding that Congress abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. The petitioners’ choice of words echoed the constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The women said, “Our hearts recoil when we consider the miseries the oppressed sons of Africa are forced to endure ... Their miseries call upon our heads the fiery vengeance and indignation of heaven.” And, the women added, the abolition of slavery hardly could be expected to advance across the land “until it be ended in the heart of our free and independent government.” The petitioners included members of radical abolitionist families—Jane McGugin doubtless was related to Daniel McGugin and

¹⁴¹ Brownsville is in Fayette County, just over the Washington County line. Letter from Joseph Mills to F.J. LeMoyne, August 2, 1837.

¹⁴² The differences in the comments of Robert R. Reed and R.H. Lee on the one hand and Judge Baird on the other suggest that the county Colonization Society, like its national parent, attracted members with widely divergent views on slavery. Letter from Joseph Mills to F.J. LeMoyne, August 2, 1837; Letter from James Miller to F.J. LeMoyne, September 21, 1837.

Susan Odenbaugh to Thomas J. Odenbaugh—but many of the women had surnames not otherwise mentioned in anti-slavery records.¹⁴³

At the urging of the American Anti-Slavery Society, radical abolitionists flooded Congress with petitions like the one from the Washington County women. Despite his membership in the Colonization Society, Congressman T.M.T. McKennan introduced at least one petition from Washington County’s immediatists. Congress eventually passed a “gag rule” requiring that such petitions be laid on the table and ignored. In effect from 1836 to 1844, the gag rule infuriated Northerners, radical abolitionists and non-abolitionists alike, who claimed a constitutional right to address and be heard by their representatives. Washington County men were among those offended. In December 1837, about 150 of them signed a pair of petitions demanding the gag rule be repealed. The signers included radical abolitionists F. J. LeMoine, James McCoy, Daniel McGugin, Samuel Mount, George K. Scott, Alexander Sweney and John White. Some of the county’s colonizationists also signed the petitions demanding the gag rule’s repeal. Their names are interspersed with those of their immediatist neighbors.¹⁴⁴

Leonard Richards asserted that many mob participants were both colonizationists and “gentlemen of property and standing,” who held higher social rank than radical abolitionists. He found that politicians, lawyers, bankers and merchants were more likely to be anti-abolitionists¹⁴⁵ than immediatists, while doctors, ministers, craftsmen and tradesmen were more likely to be immediatists than anti-abolitionists. Edward Magdol provided his own evidence for radical

¹⁴³ Petition of Washington County women for the abolition of slavery, February 14, 1838, Library of Congress Collection HR25A, Record Group 233, National Archives, Washington, DC.

¹⁴⁴ Richards, 3, 162-163; Joseph F. McFarland, 1:130; Petitions of Washington County men to rescind the gag rule, February 14, 1838, and May 21, 1838, Library of Congress Collection HR25A, Record Group 233, National Archives; Letter from American Anti-Slavery Society to auxiliaries, May 22, 1837, WCHS Archives, Box A-24, Folder 15.

¹⁴⁵ Richards used the term “anti-abolitionists” to refer to colonizationists and others who participated in anti-abolition mobs.

abolitionism's strong support among skilled workers, farmers and those who otherwise might be considered working class and middle class. If Washington County's colonizationists and radical abolitionists were closer in social and economic standing than their peers elsewhere in the country, that difference might have explained the groups' collaboration during the 1830s. But that was not the case. The groups cooperated even though they generally fit the profiles sketched by Richards and Magdol.¹⁴⁶

During the 1830s, three members of the Washington County Colonization Society—T.M.T. McKennan, Isaac Leet and Joseph Lawrence—served in Congress. McKennan and Robert R. Reed also served in Congress during the 1840s. No known county immediatist served in Congress during either decade. Leet also served in the state Senate and Thomas McGiffin and Joseph Lawrence in the state House during the 1830s. Lawrence resigned from the House to serve as state treasurer. Though Joseph Ritner served as governor and Joseph Henderson served in the state House during the 1830s, the county's radical abolitionists, overall, had fewer representatives in high government office than the colonizationists did.¹⁴⁷ In addition, the county Colonization Society rolls included the top members of the county's intelligentsia, including Reverend David Elliott, the interim Washington College president and longtime college trustee; the Reverend David McConaughy, Elliott's successor as college president; and professors W.K. McDonald, W.P. Alrich, John L. Gow and R.H. Lee. No known immediatists were among the college faculty during the 1830s. Elliott also served as pastor of Washington's First Presbyterian Church, the most prestigious house of worship in the county.¹⁴⁸ The radical abolitionists had the support of a handful of ministers with lesser pulpits. These included the Reverend Alexander

¹⁴⁶ Richards, 30n17, 131-133, 139-140; Magdol, 68.

¹⁴⁷ Creigh, 251-252, 254.

¹⁴⁸ Table 1; Coleman, 126-127; "Colonization and Abolition," May 24, 1834; "Public Meeting," June 7, 1834; W&J, *Catalogue*, 266.

Donnan, who had churches in Burgettstown and Mount Pleasant; the Reverend Wesley Kenney, who had the Methodist Episcopal Church in Washington; and Reverend Charles Wheeler, pastor of Washington's First Baptist Church and a teacher.¹⁴⁹

In the Bairs, Alexander Reed, Thomas McGiffin and Daniel Moore, the Colonization Society had the backing of the county's most influential merchants and businessmen. Both movements attracted lesser businessmen. The county Anti-Slavery Society, for example, included Alexander Sweney, a merchant; James Reed, a jeweler and watch-maker; and George K. Scott, a farmer and merchant, while the county Colonization Society included Daniel Rider, a tanner; George Wilson, a storekeeper and clothier; and Wallace McWilliams, a grist mill owner, merchant and farmer. Most important, however, the leaders of the county's colonizationists and radical abolitionists—men like LeMoyne, Joseph Templeton, Alexander Reed, Thomas H. Baird and T.M.T. McKennan—fit Richards' archetypes.¹⁵⁰

It appears that community solidarity, not class solidarity, drove immediatist-colonizationist cooperation during the 1830s. There is no evidence from Washington County to support Richards' assertion that, in some locales, radical abolitionists attempted to undercut the community leadership structure. Rather, the evidence suggests that immediatists and colonizationists built and sustained alliances because of a mutual desire for family and community uplift. If so, colonization and radical abolitionism simply may have represented different paths forward for men who shared a vision of prosperity and realized that slavery had no place in their world. Washington County's civic leaders were not laboring in a vacuum. Across the Northeast and parts of the Midwest, the early republican period was characterized by

¹⁴⁹ Table 1; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 517-520, 530; W.A. McConnell, "The United Presbyterian Congregation of Mount Pleasant," in Crumrine, *History of Washington County*, 863.

¹⁵⁰ Table 1

the rapid development of roads, canals, railroads, common schools, institutions of higher learning, banks and other community infrastructure. The building of a nation—Alexis de Tocqueville called it a “sort of tumult”—proceeded apace. “In the United States, the man of the people understands the influence that general prosperity exerts on his happiness ... He therefore sees in the public fortune his own, and he works for the good of the state not only out of duty or out of pride, but I would almost dare say out of cupidity,” Tocqueville observed. Washington County’s colonizationists and radical abolitionists could see the march of progress around them—the Steubenville seminary was but one example—and doubtless felt a need to keep up. It would have made little sense for the groups—whose families already had decades of cooperation to their credit and who had weathered previous disagreements and scandals—to let progress stall over slavery.¹⁵¹

If enlightened self-interest provided the incentive for collaboration, self-control may have been important to keeping collaborations on track. The county’s immediatists and colonizationists liberally criticized each other’s position on slavery, but they seem to have refrained from attacking one another personally. That is, radical abolitionists might attack the colonizationist agenda and vice versa, but F.J. LeMoyne did not criticize Alexander Reed, John Grayson or any other colonizationist by name and neither Reed nor Grayson nor any other colonizationist disparaged LeMoyne for his beliefs. Not even in the aftermath of the Samuel Gould violence—the time when personal attacks might have been expected—did the groups yield to temptation. Neither in newspaper accounts nor private papers were representatives of either camp called out by name—a level of restraint remarkable given the tenor of the times. As Leonard Richards observed, “Almost every town and village in the nation had at least one editor

¹⁵¹ Richards, 61-62; Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. Harvey C. Manfield and Delba Winthrop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 226, 232.

who in vileness and vulgarity approached James Fenimore Cooper's Steadfast Dodge. Not only the penny presses but the more 'respectable' presses used with abandon words such as 'cur,' 'fool,' 'knave,' 'scoundrel,' 'wretch.'" If they wanted to spread vitriol, Grayson and LeMoyne certainly had the tools at their disposal. Grayson owned the general-circulation *Washington Examiner* during the 1830s, and LeMoyne published an abolitionist newspaper, *The Patriot*, during the 1840s.¹⁵²

Bonds of civility, forged during the harsh frontier period and reinforced by deepening kinship and civic ties as the community grew, may have helped to keep tempers and tongues in check. In *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770-1860*, Christopher Morris documented similar norms and mores. "Isolation and need forced people into associations not always to their liking," Morris said. Even as Warren County grew, he said, "A mesh of kinship ties formed during the early years connected households and the resources they controlled and continued to give structure to the rural neighborhood." There were repercussions—sometimes violent ones—for those who violated Warren County's informal code of conduct. Perhaps, in light of the attacks on Samuel Gould, that also was the case in Washington County.¹⁵³

Gould's conduct in Washington and Williamsport may have upset a delicate equilibrium between immediatists and colonizationists. Exactly what Gould said on those visits is not known. However, given the bold rhetoric in the local immediatists' declaration of sentiments and the enthusiasm with which they espoused their cause, it is unlikely that a mere recitation of radical

¹⁵² Colonizationist William Jack also had an ownership interest in the *Examiner* during part of the 1830s. Richards, 22-23; McCulloch, 145; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 488, 508.

¹⁵³ Christopher Morris, *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County, and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770-1860* (Cary, NC: Oxford University Press, USA, 1999), 85, 87-88, <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/duquesne/docDetail.action?docID=10317727> (accessed July 2, 2014).

abolitionist doctrine would have placed the itinerant speaker in harm's way. The flashpoint might have been Gould's characterization of the radical abolitionists' rivals or the community. If he offended local sensibilities in some way—say, by maligning individual colonizationists—his opponents might have been roused to violence. Gould clearly was not accorded the same respect as local immediatists. He is the only radical abolitionist known to be mobbed while lecturing in the county and the only one criticized by name in a local newspaper. Tellingly, after the violence in Washington, immediatists and colonizationists alike moved quickly to restore peace.

Alexander Reed decried the violence, and LeMoyne seems to have consented to the slap on the wrist given to the five men charged in the attack on Gould. While Leonard Richards saw the radical abolitionists' criticism of the colonization movement as a catalyst for anti-abolition violence, he did not say whether criticism of individual colonizationists was a factor.¹⁵⁴

As Andrew S. Barker demonstrated in his study of Chauncey Langdon Knapp, associating with colonizationists did not necessarily make one less of a radical abolitionist. And, as Julie Roy Jeffrey showed, female abolitionists managed to promote their cause without alienating family and friends who may have resisted the message. Washington County's colonizationists and radical abolitionists also acted pragmatically, cooperating where and when they could while doing what was necessary to keep peace among themselves. If the national leaders of radical abolitionism could not agree on strategy—to what extent should women be involved? Was political activity a legitimate vehicle for abolitionist advocacy? Was Garrison's churlishness a hindrance?—it certainly seems plausible that immediatists at the grassroots level felt free to tailor their activism to local circumstances. F.J. LeMoyne detested Garrison's

¹⁵⁴ "The Commotion at Williamsport," August 6, 1836; Richards, 23-26; Forrest, 1:420; "Colonization Meeting," June 25, 1836.

extremism, as Knapp did, so it is not surprising that the level-headed and independent-minded doctor managed to work for radical abolitionism and with colonizationists at the same time.¹⁵⁵

In *The Impending Crisis: America before the Civil War, 1848-1861*, David M. Potter noted that contradictory evidence inevitably befuddles scholars who ask whether Northerners opposed slavery. He said it would be more appropriate to ask, “What was the rank of antislavery in the hierarchy of northern values?” The latter question, he said, reflects the truism that “politics is usually less concerned with the attainment of one value than with the reconciliation of a number of them.” His point provides insight into the relationship between Washington County’s immediatists and colonizationists, who placed slavery on the spectrum of interests commanding their attention during the 1830s. Potter said compartmentalization enabled Northerners to support some anti-slavery measures (such as emancipation in their own states), oppose others (federal interference with slavery in the South, for example) and remain loyal to a union that was part slave and part free. The evidence in Washington County suggests that mental gymnastics occurred at the grassroots level, too, enabling radical abolitionists and colonizationists to preserve social networks and form alliances on some issues while disagreeing about slavery.¹⁵⁶

Further, the cooperative spirit of the 1830s continued into the late antebellum period, with immediatists and colonizationists and their families creating the Washington Gas Works and Washington Cemetery in the 1850s¹⁵⁷ and establishing the Second Presbyterian Church of Washington in March 1861. The town’s growth required these ventures. Observed the Reverend

¹⁵⁵ Barker, 445-446, 454; Walters, *The Antislavery Appeal*, 10-13; McCulloch, 136; Jeffrey, 9-11.

¹⁵⁶ David M. Potter, *The Impending Crisis: America before the Civil War, 1848-1861* (1976; repr., New York: Harper Perennial, 2011), 44-47.

¹⁵⁷ The founders of the Washington Gas Works included radical abolitionists Joseph Henderson, F.J. LeMoyne and Samuel Hazlett and colonizationists Jacob Slagle and William Smith. The founders of Washington Cemetery included Henderson and colonizationists Samuel Cunningham, John L. Gow and John Wishart. Creigh, 207-208.

George P. Hays, “The First church had become so full that there hardly was room for their own people, and, of course, not much invitation for others.”¹⁵⁸

T.M.T. McKennan, patron of the National Road, spent his final years engrossed in another infrastructure project—creation of the Hempfield Railroad—and died “while attending to its affairs” in 1852. Thomas H. Baird further muddled his legacy in 1863, when he sent a twenty-page missive to Congress criticizing Abraham Lincoln and the Confiscation Acts, calling the Emancipation Proclamation unconstitutional and alleging that radical abolitionists would “derange the system of the universe, in order to carry out their wild and impracticable scheme.” As a basis for ending the war and returning the South to the Union, he proposed gradual emancipation of slaves and a national commitment to colonization, using public lands to compensate planters for loss of their human property. Congress ignored the proposal. Baird outlived his more moderate son-in-law, Robert R. Reed, who died in 1864 while serving in the state Legislature. Representative James Kelley praised his colleague’s devotion to the Colonization Society and, in a reference to emancipation, said Reed “was blessed, inasmuch as he was permitted to witness the almost utter removal from the land of that evil he strove so assiduously to eradicate.”¹⁵⁹ F.J. LeMoyne, gratified by the end of slavery but mortified by the human cost of obtaining it, gave money for a freedmen’s school in Tennessee. He also found

¹⁵⁸ The founders of Second Presbyterian included Joseph Henderson and descendants of Thomas H. Baird, John Grayson, F.J. LeMoyne, Thomas McGiffin, Alexander Reed and John Wishart. By the time the Second Church actually began operation in 1864, many of the founders had returned to First Presbyterian. George P. Hays, *History of the Second Presbyterian Church, Washington, Penn’a, as Delivered before the Congregation on Sabbath July 9, 1876* (Washington, PA: Swan & Ecker, Review and Examiner Office, n.d.), 3, 7, 23, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/historyofsecondp00hays> (accessed March 20, 2015).

¹⁵⁹ Beers, 1:14; Thomas H. Baird, *Memorial of Hon. Th. H. Baird Praying for the Enactment of Measures to Preserve the Constitution and Union of the States* (Pittsburgh: A.A. Anderson, 1864), 6, 7, 18, 2-23, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/memorialofhonth00bair> (accessed March 21, 2015); James Kelley, untitled remarks, in *Addresses on the Occasion of the Death of the Hon. Robert R. Reed, a Representative from the County of Washington, Delivered in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, January 4, 1865* (Harrisburg: Singerly & Myers, State Printers, 1865), 8-9, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/addressesonoccas00penn> (accessed March 20, 2015).

new ways to help his own community, endowing two chairs at Washington and Jefferson College and making a donation for Washington's first town hall and library.¹⁶⁰

There is more to the story. Additional research on how colonizationists and radical abolitionists interacted at the local level would yield a more thorough understanding of the two movements and lead to a more complete picture of how communities developed during the early republican period. Was the collaboration documented in Washington County typical elsewhere, as fragmentary evidence from Meriden, Connecticut, seems to suggest? Did immediatists and colonizationists cooperate across county lines on regional projects, such as turnpikes or railroads? Were national and state leaders of the colonizationist and radical abolitionist movements aware of their members' local or regional partnerships?

While many questions are unanswered, it is clear that radical abolitionist-colonizationist collaboration in Washington County yielded lasting dividends. In 1865, Washington College—once on the verge of extinction—became the dominant partner in the long-discussed merger with Jefferson College. Washington Female Seminary survived until 1948, more than 100 years after the organizational meeting held in T.M.T. McKennan's home. Immediatists and colonizationists instilled the importance of collaboration in their descendants, who took up the mantle of responsibility for the college, seminary, Franklin Bank and other community institutions. And while colonizationist-radical abolitionist collaboration helped to shape Washington County, it also had a broader impact.¹⁶¹ Charlotte LeMoyne noted as much in one account boasting of the seminary:

We may tell you of its 800 graduates; of the still larger number of pupils who have attended its sessions; of the teachers and missionaries who have gone out from its halls to

¹⁶⁰ McCulloch, 204, 219-220, 222. The freedmen's school, today known as LeMoyne-Owen College, is in Memphis, Tennessee. Washington, PA, still is home to the LeMoyne Multi-Cultural Center.

¹⁶¹ In 2015, Washington and Jefferson College marked the 150th anniversary of the merger. Table 2; W&J, *Catalogue*, 266, 267, 388-390; Branton, 122; Wills, 27; Creigh, 198-199, 207-208; "Trustees," 50.

instruct and benefit the world; of its present numbers and prosperous condition. But all this does not, and cannot, express the influence and beneficent effects of a liberal and refined system of education upon so many young women, or the ever-increasing and widening sphere of their influence upon families and society. These effects are intangible but powerful, and cannot be estimated; they reach throughout this life and into the eternity beyond.¹⁶²

¹⁶² Wills, 27.

Table 1: This is a list of the known Washington County colonizationists and radical abolitionists. The occupations of some are not known.

Colonizationists
W.P. Alrich, Washington College professor
Thomas H. Baird, judge
William Baird, attorney
J. Blaney, Washington College student
Ezekiel Clarke
John S. Cratty
Hugh Cunningham, Washington College student
Samuel Cunningham, bank clerk
Thaddeus Dodd, minister and Washington Academy principal
David Elliott, minister and Washington College president
Aaron Fenton
John L. Gow
John Grayson, owner of <i>Washington Examiner</i>
Samuel Hamilton, postmaster
Andrew Hays
John Hays, farmer and wool mill owner
Thomas Hoge, minister
William Hopkins, tanner, state representative and National Road commissioner
James Hughes
William Hunter, merchant
William Jack, co-owner, <i>Washington Examiner</i>
Alexander Jones, Washington College student
Levin or William Joynes, Washington College student
Jesse Kenworthy
John Kerr, minister and teacher
Joseph Lawrence, lawyer, state representative and state treasurer
R.H. Lee, Washington College professor
Isaac Leet, lawyer, state senator and congressman
Thomas McCall, state representative and state senator
Barclay McClain
William McCombs, Washington College student
David McConaughy, minister and Washington College president
W.K. McDonald, Washington College professor
T.M.T. McKennan, lawyer and congressman
Wallace McWilliams, militia general and state representative
J. Mills, minister
John Moody, Washington College student
Daniel Moore, merchant and stage proprietor
John Morrison, farmer

Samuel Murdoch, doctor
James Noble, cabinetmaker and undertaker
W.H. Oldham, Washington College student
James Patterson, farmer and grist mill owner
Robert Patterson, farmer and surveyor
James Paull, Washington College student
Alexander Reed, merchant, farmer and real estate investor
John Reed
Robert R. Reed, doctor
A.T. Reese, minister
Daniel Rider, tanner
N. Shotwell, minister
William Simpson Jr.
Jacob Slagle, owned saddlery and hardware business
William Smith, merchant
William Vance, sheep farmer and state representative
J. Willson
George Wilson, storekeeper and clothier
John Wishart, doctor
Robert Witherow
Andrew Yates

Radical abolitionists
R.F. Biddle, doctor and lawyer
D. Blair
John S. Brady, lawyer
John Carey
William Cornwell
Richard Curran
Luther Day, farmer
Alexander Donnan, minister
Z. Eddy
Henry Enlow, justice of the peace
Ephraim Estep
Alexander Gordon, farmer
William Hamilton, minister and missionary
John C. Hanna
J. Harper
Samuel Hazlett, banker and businessman
Joseph Henderson, attorney and state representative
John Huston
Benjamin Kenney, farmer

Wesley Kenney, minister
William Kenney, minister
W.L. Lafferty, doctor
Robert Lattimer
F.J. LeMoyne, doctor and businessman
James McCoy, farmer
John McCoy, farmer
Kenneth McCoy, farmer
Joseph McDowell, farmer
Samuel McFarland, attorney
Daniel McGugin, farmer
Matthew McKeever
Thomas McKeever, justice of the peace and associate judge
James Miller
Joseph Mills
Samuel Mount, merchant
Thomas J. Odenbaugh, postmaster
Stephen Parcell
James Reed, jeweler and watchmaker
John Reed
Joseph Ritner, governor
William Robb
George K. Scott, merchant
Patterson Scott
Stephen Smith, doctor
Alexander Sweney, merchant
Joseph Templeton, doctor
Samuel Vance, farmer
Charles Wheeler, minister
John White, doctor

Source: "Anti-Slavery Meeting," November 8, 1834; "Public Meeting," June 7, 1834; "Colonization and Abolition," May 24, 1834; "Colonization Meeting," April 16, 1836; "Colonization Proceedings," May 28, 1836; "Colonization Meeting," June 25, 1836; "First Anniversary of the Washington Anti-Slavery Society," *Our Country* July 30, 1835; "First Anniversary of the Washington County Anti-Slavery Society," *Washington Examiner*, July 9, 1836; Appendix to *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll*, 46-47; "Auxiliary Societies," 148; Biddle, 4-5; Ella Campbell Slagle Nichols, *Family History* (n.p., n.d.), 22, 24, 111-112, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/familyrecord00nich> (accessed August 2, 2014); "Little v. Hazlett," 855; Beers, 1:114-117, 785, 1021-1022, 1279-1280, 1335-1336, 1453; Creigh, 251-254, 256, 261-263, 275; W&J, *Catalogue*, 264, 290-291, 297, 318; Crumrine, "Donegal Township," 754-755, 758; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 488, 491, 493, 508, 529, 546-547, 560-561; 727; Crumrine, "Mount Pleasant Township," 850; Boyd Crumrine, "Buffalo Township," in *History of Washington County*, 674-675; Boyd Crumrine, "Canonsburg," in *History of Washington County*, 624; Boyd Crumrine, "Chartiers Township," in *History of Washington County*, 712; Boyd Crumrine, "Cross Creek Township," in *History of Washington County*, 722, 728, 740-741; Boyd Crumrine, "Educational History," in *History of Washington County*,

453; Boyd Crumrine, "Hopewell Township," in *History of Washington County*, 816-817; Boyd Crumrine, "Nottingham Township," in *History of Washington County*, 884-885; Boyd Crumrine, "Smith Township," in *History of Washington County*, 915; Boyd Crumrine, "South Strabane Township," in *History of Washington County*, 957; Searight, 177.

Table 2: This table shows the familial and social ties linking Washington County's radical abolitionists and colonizationists with graduates of Washington College. Some graduates, marked with an "RA" or a "C," were radical abolitionists or colonizationists themselves. In one measure of the college's impact on the community, many graduates remained in town after their schooling.

Graduate	RA or C?	Year Graduated	Relationship to others	Stayed in Town?
Baird, William	C	1808	Son of Absalom Baird, brother of Thomas H. Baird	Y
McKenna, T.M.T.	C	1810	Son of William McKenna; father, grandfather, etc., of other graduates	Y
Ewing, Nathaniel		1812	Studied law with Thomas McGiffin	Y
Brady, John S.	RA	1813	Studied law with, married daughter of, civic leader Parker Campbell	Y
Bowman, Jacob Lowry		1813	Brother-in-law of T.M.T. McKenna	
Ewing, John Hoge		1814	Studied law with Thomas McGiffin	Y
Addison, Alexander		1815	Studied law with T.M.T. McKenna	Y
LeMoyne, F.J.	RA	1815	Father, grandfather of college graduates	Y
Moore, Henry		1815	Son of Daniel Moore; related to Leet family	
Wilson, John K.		1815	Related by marriage to Baird and Leet families	Y
Cotton, Henry		1816	Studied medicine with John Wishart	Y
Clark, Birmingham McKenna		1818	Studied law with T.M.T. McKenna	Y
Bowman, William Robert		1822	Brother-in-law of T.M.T. McKenna	
Leet, Isaac	C	1822		Y
McKenna, James Wilson		1822	Brother of T.M.T. McKenna	Y
Murdoch, John S.		1822	Son of Samuel Murdoch	Y
Wilson, Alexander		1822	Studied law with William Baird; related to Leet family	Y
Jennings, Thomas R.		1823	Son of Obadiah Jennings, who was onetime pastor of First Presbyterian Church and a college trustee	
Reed, Robert R.	C	1824	Son of Alexander Reed; studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne; married daughter of Thomas H. Baird	Y

Henderson, James P.		1825	Son-in-law of college trustee John Hoge	
Wise, Henry Alexander		1825	Married daughter of Obadiah Jennings	
Campbell, Francis		1826	Son of Parker Campbell	Y
Jennings, Jacob		1826	Nephew of Obadiah Jennings	
Acheson, Alexander		1827	Studied law with William Baird; married daughter of John Wishart	Y
Acheson, John		1827	Brother-in-law to John Wishart's daughter.	
Humrickhouse, Thomas Shuman		1828	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Gordon, George		1832	Son of Alexander Gordon	
Fulton, Robert		1833	Professor of languages, Washington College	Y
McKannan, William		1833	Son of, studied law with, T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Lafferty, W.L.	RA	1833		Y
Boggs, James		1834	Married daughter of civic leader James Orr	
Garrett, William		1834	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Hamilton, William	RA	1834	Married Julia A.N. McGiffin, daughter of Thomas McGiffin	
Hawkins, William B		1835	Studied medicine with John Wishart	Y
McCoy, John Brice		1835	Son of Col. John McCoy	Y
Brownson, James I.		1836	Related to Wishart family by marriage; president of college	Y
Caldwell, Alfred		1836	Married daughter of George Baird	
Cummins, Robert Hazlett		1836	Nephew of Samuel Hazlett; studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Elliott, Thomas Holliday		1836	Son of David Elliott; studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Hamilton, George Plumer		1836	Studied law with John S. Brady and R.F. Biddle	Y
Koontz, Robert Hamilton		1836	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
McClean, Oliver O.		1837	His family had professional and familial ties to David McConaughy	
Roberts, Lewis		1837	Studied law with Isaac Leet	Y
Wills, John Alexander		1837	Married daughter of F.J. LeMoyne	Y

McConaughy, David		1840	Nephew of Rev. David McConaughy	
Officer, Thomas		1840	Second cousin of George K. Scott	
Orr, William L.		1840	Studied medicine with John Wishart	Y
Shaffer, John E.		1840	Studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Simpson, James		1840	Studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Slagle, Christopher W.		1840	Son of Jacob Slagle; studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Baird, Absalom		1841	Son of William Baird; studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Clark, Hervey H.		1841	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
McGiffin, George Wallace		1841	Son of Thomas McGiffin; studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
McGiffin, Norton		1841	Son of Thomas McGiffin	Y
Wills, Isaac L.		1841	Brother-in-law of Charlotte LeMoyne Wills	
Wills, William J.		1841	Brother-in-law of Charlotte LeMoyne Wills	
Baird, Thomas H.		1842	Son of Judge Thomas H. Baird	Y
Baldwin, Caleb		1842	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Grayson, William		1842	Son of John Grayson	
Hart, George S.		1842	Studied law with John L. Gow	Y
McKennan, Thomas		1842	Son of T.M.T McKennan; studied medicine with W.L. Lafferty	Y
Reed, Joseph Allison		1842	Son of James Reed; studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Reed, David		1843	Son of James Reed; studied law with T.M.T McKennan	Y
Hupp, John Cox		1844	Studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
McCoy, Alexander		1844	Son of Col. John McCoy	
Marshall, Alexander Addison		1844	Studied medicine with W.L. Lafferty	Y
Morrison, Joseph Scott		1844	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Officer, John Scott		1844	Third cousin of George K. Scott	
Van Voorhis, John S.		1844	Studied medicine with R.F. Biddle	Y
Baird, William M.		1845	Son of William Baird	Y

Cummins, James		1845	Nephew of Samuel Hazlett	Y
Koontz, John S. Brady		1845	Studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Oliver, George Hewes		1845	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Wilson, David S.		1845	Related to Leet family; married daughter of George Baird	Y
Acheson, Marcus W.		1846	Related to Leet and Baird families	Y
Grayson, Wray		1846	Son of John Grayson; married daughter of Samuel Hazlett	Y
Logan, Thomas H.		1846	Studied medicine with John Wishart	Y
McMillin, John		1846	Studied law with John L. Gow	Y
Miller, George W.		1846	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Sanns, John		1846	Grandson of F.J. LeMoyne	
Wishart, John Wilson		1846	Son of John Wishart	Y
Baird, George		1847	Son of George Baird	Y
Gow, Alexander Murdock		1847	Son of John L. Gow	Y
Lee, Richard Henry		1847	Son of R.H. Lee	
LeMoyne, John V.		1847	Son of F.J. LeMoyne	
Moore, William S.		1847	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Neely, Edward B.		1847	Married daughter of Jacob Slagle	
Quail, Huston		1847	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Baird, A. Todd		1848	Son of George Baird	Y
Clark, James Murray		1848	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Craig, John H.		1848	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Slagle, Jacob F.		1848	Son of Jacob Slagle; studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Wotring, Jonathan		1848	Son of civic leader Abraham Wotring; studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Hazlett, Robert W.		1848	Son of Samuel Hazlett	Y
Allen, Milton		1849	Studied medicine with R.F. Biddle	Y
Martin, John White		1849	Studied medicine with John Wishart	Y

Officer, Robert P.		1849	Studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Ritchie, Andrew S.		1849	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Brady, Freeman		1851	Studied law with John L. Gow	Y
Ewing, John		1851	Studied law with T.M.T. McKennan	Y
McClean, William		1851	His family and professional and familial ties to Rev. David McConaughy	
McKennan, John T.		1851	Son of T.M.T McKennan	
Reed, Thomas Baird		1852	Son of Robert R. Reed; grandson of Alexander Reed and of Thomas Baird	
Smith, William Wrenchall		1852	Married granddaughter of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Taylor, Thomas Jefferson		1852	Married daughter of W.P. Alrich	
Wishart, Alexander		1852	Son of John Wishart	Y
Ewing, George C.		1853	Married daughter of Judge Thomas H. Baird	
McKennan, Thomas T.		1854	Nephew of T.M.T. McKennan	
Scott, George Kerr		1854	Son of George K. Scott	Y
Slagle, Bernard Wolff		1854	Son of Jacob Slagle	Y
Wishart, Marcus		1854	Son of John Wishart	Y
Little, Joseph Harris		1855	Studied medicine with John Wishart	Y
Acheson, John Wishart		1857	Grandson of John Wishart	Y
Woods, Henry		1857	Married daughter of civic leader John H. Ewing	Y
Wotring, Frederick W.		1857	Son of civic leader Abraham Wotring	Y
Caldwell, George Baird		1859	Grandson of George Baird	
Childs, William Riddle		1860	Married granddaughter of John Wishart	
Griffith, Samuel T.		1860	Son of civic leader John R. Griffith; studied law with John L. Gow	Y
Benham, Silas N.		1861	Studied medicine with F.J. LeMoyne	Y
Clark, James B.		1861	Married granddaughter of Alexander Reed	

Doyle, George		1861	Studied law with John L. Gow	Y
Foulke, Henry C.		1861	Married daughter of W.P. Alrich	
McClintock, John Calvin		1862	Related to T.M.T. McKennan	
Reed, Robert R.		1862	Son of Robert R. Reed; grandson of Alexander Reed and Judge Thomas H. Baird	
Gow, John Loudon		1862	Son of John L. Gow	Y
Ewing, James B.		1863	Grandson of Judge Thomas H. Baird	
Brownson, John M.		1865	Son of James I. Brownson; Step-nephew to John Wishart's daughter	
Donnan, Ingham W.		1866	Grandson of Alexander Donnan	Y
Donnan, John White		1866	Grandson of John White and of Alexander Donnan	Y
Streator, Alexander C.		1866	Studied medicine with son of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Acheson, Alexander Wilson		1866	Grandson of John Wishart; studied medicine with son of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Darley, Alexander M.		1868	Married daughter of John L. Gow	
Acheson, Joseph M.		1868	Grandson of John Wishart	Y
Murdock, John Huey		1869	Son of civic leader Alexander Murdoch (or Murdock); studied law with John L. Gow	Y
Jones, George O.		1869	Studied law with John L. Gow	Y
Rush, William J.		1869	Grandson of Judge Thomas H. Baird	
Reed, Colin M.		1869	Son of Robert R. Reed; grandson of Alexander Reed and Judge Thomas H. Baird	Y
Acheson, Marcus Cunningham		1870	Grandson of John Wishart; married daughter of John L. Gow	Y
Lawrence, Joseph H.		1870	Grandson of Joseph Lawrence	
Johnson, James Caughey		1871	Married granddaughter of George Baird	
Reed, Alexander		1871	Grandson of Alexander Reed; son of Colin Reed; nephew of Robert R. Reed	Y
Borland, Matthew Henry		1873	Studied medicine with son of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Brownson, James I		1875	Son of James I. Brownson; step-nephew to John Wishart's daughter	

Donnan, Alvin or Alvan		1875	Grandson of Alexander Donnan and John White	Y
Hayes, Sheldon B.		1875	Studied medicine with son of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Acheson, Ernest Francis		1875	Grandson of John Wishart	Y
Donnan, Edmund Arthur		1877	Grandson of Alexander Donnan and John White	Y
Acheson, Harry Martyn		1877	Grandson of John Wishart	
Bonar, Barnet L.		1877	Studied medicine with son of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Harding, Charles Vachel		1877	Grandson of F.J. LeMoynes	Y
Brownson, Marcus Acheson		1878	Son of James I. Brownson; step-nephew to John Wishart's daughter	Y
Hallock, Harvey T.		1878	Married daughter of John Wishart	
McClenethan, John Carter		1878	Studied medicine with son of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Linton, Edwin		1879	Married step-niece to John Wishart's daughter	Y
McKennan, T.M.T.		1879	Grandson of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Post, Silas B.		1879	Studied medicine with John Grayson's son	Y
McKennan, David W.		1880	Grandson of T.M.T. McKennan	
Gow, Alexander M.		1881	Grandson of John L. Gow	
McKennan, William Jr.		1882	Grandson of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Baird, George		1883	Grandson of George Baird	
Brownson, Robert McKennan		1886	Son of James I. Brownson; step-niece to John Wishart's daughter	Y
McKennan, Moore Stockton		1889	Grandson of T.M.T. McKennan	Y
Baird, William Absalom		1889	Grandson of George Baird; grand-nephew of Judge Thomas H. Baird	Y

Source: W&J, *Catalogue*, 271-275, 277, 280-281, 283-285, 288-298, 300-301, 306-313, 315, 317-319, 321, 323-332, 335-336, 338-339, 343, 345, 348-349, 353-354, 356, 359, 361-362, 365-366, 370-371, 375-377, 381, 399-400, 405, 407, 410, 416, 418, 419-421, 423, 427-430, 433-437, 440, 442, 444, 447, 449, 451, 458, 465-466; Beers, I:102, 129; Coleman, 49; Crumrine, *The Courts of Justice*, 63; Crumrine, "Smith Township," 921; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 482, 487; Crumrine, "Nottingham Township," 883; Crumrine, "Mount Pleasant Township," 854-865; J.

L. Ziegler, *An Authentic History of Donegal Presbyterian Church Located in East Donegal Township, Lancaster County, Pa.* (Philadelphia: F. McManus Jr. and Co., 1902), 55, 56, Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/authentichistory00zieg> (accessed September 8, 2014); William Hamilton, I:62; Seilhamer, 66; Nichols, 22, 24; Baird genealogy, Ancestry.com.

Table 3: This table shows the ties linking Washington County's immediatists and colonizationists with alumnae of the Washington Female Seminary. The table also shows the graduates' broader community connections.

Alumna	Year graduated	Relationship to immediatist or colonizationist	Other community tie
Christiana Darling	1838		Married Washington College graduate William B. Hawkins
Rebecca Garrett	1838		Taught in Washington common schools
Mary A. Bunce	1839		Married Washington College graduate John A. Smith
Ann Slagle	1839	Daughter of Jacob Slagle	
Charlotte LeMoyne	1841	Daughter of F.J. LeMoyne	Married Washington College graduate John Wills
Isabella M. Quail	1841		Married Washington College graduate William Ewing
Margaretta Wishart	1841	Daughter of John Wishart	
Martha J. Ashton	1842		Married Washington College graduate John T. Brownlee
Martha Grayson	1842	Daughter of John Grayson	Worked as Washington librarian
Ann LeMoyne	1842	Daughter of F.J. LeMoyne	Married Vachel Harding, Washington and Jefferson College trustee
Adaline J. Officer	1842		Married Washington College graduate John B. Krepps
Mary Newton	1843		Married Washington College graduate Cephas Gregg
Ann E. McKennan	1844	Daughter of T.M.T. McKennan	
Jane Baird	1845	Daughter of William Baird; niece of Thomas H. Baird	
Sarah H. Quail	1844, 1845	Married Norton McGiffin, son of Thomas McGiffin	
Charlotte A. Sweney	1845	Likely the daughter of Alexander Sweney	
Lovila or Lovela Hagans	1846		Married Washington College graduate Lucian A. Hagans

Hannah M. List	1846		Married Washington College graduate Andrew Hopkins
Eliza List	1846	Married Thomas H. Logan, who studied medicine with John Wishart	
Agnes M. Rankin	1846		Married Washington College graduate Byron Porter
Maria Baird	1847	Daughter of William Baird; niece of Thomas H. Baird	Married College graduate Alfred Caldwell
Catharine Baird	1847	Daughter of William Baird; niece of Thomas H. Baird	
Margaret Hazlett	1847	Daughter of Samuel Hazlett; married Wray Grayson, son of John Grayson	
Romaine LeMoyne	1847	Daughter of F.J. LeMoyne	Married a neighbor, Nicholas V. Wade
Catharine Wishart	1847	Likely the niece or daughter of John Wishart	
Mary Wotring	1847	Daughter of civic leader Abraham Wotring, who worked with immediatists and colonizationists	
Rebecca D. Harding	1848	Second cousin of Isaac Leet; extended family by her sister's marriage included Daniel Moore and John L. Gow	Became the prominent author Rebecca Harding Davis
Mary McKean	1848		Married Washington College graduate John C. McClintock
Susan Alrich	1849	Daughter of W.P. Alrich	Married Washington College graduate Thomas J. Taylor
Mary E. Hazlett	1849	Daughter of Samuel Hazlett	
Margaret McKaig	1849		Taught at Washington Female Seminary
Janette Lourie	1849		Taught at Washington Female Seminary
Martha C. Plumer	1849		Married Washington College graduate John P. Hornish
Margaret Stockton	1849	Married son of T.M.T. McKennan	

Jane E. Sweney	1849	Likely the daughter of Alexander Sweney	
Hannah M. Taggart	1849	Married Jacob F. Slagle, son of Jacob Slagle	
Jane LeMoyne	1850	Daughter of F.J. LeMoyne	Assistant town librarian
Annie E. Kenney	1851	Likely related to the Kenney family of immediatists	
Kate Wotring	1851	Daughter of Abraham Wotring	
Mary R. Christy	1852		Married Washington College graduate Alexander S. Marshall
S. Anna Donahey	1852		Married Washington College graduate James M. Shields
Sarah C. Hazlett	1852	Daughter of Samuel Hazlett	
Sarah C. Sweney	1852	Likely the daughter of Alexander Sweney	
Jennie Baird	1853	Daughter of Thomas H. Baird; niece of William Baird	
Mary E. Donley	1853	Married Truman Brady, who studied law with John L. Gow	
Mary L. Ewing	1853	Daughter of John Hoge Ewing, who collaborated with immediatists and colonizationists on civic initiatives	Married Washington College graduate Henry Woods
Jane Hays	1853	Married Samuel Gamble McFarland, nephew of Samuel McFarland	
Margaretta B. Vowell	1853	Married Bernard W. Slagle, son of Jacob Slagle; likely the sister-in-law of Samuel Hazlett's daughter, Sarah, who married Stewart B. Vowell	
Margaret G. Guthrie	1854		Married Washington College graduate John F. Hill

Source: *Catalogue of the Officers and Pupils of the Washington Female Seminary*, 5-12; Gamble, 45; W&J, *Catalogue*, 101, 293, 296, 301, 307-308, 311, 316, 320, 322, 324, 325, 335, 338, 343, 348, 350-351, 353, 357, 359, 375, 390, 435, 441; Seilhamer, 66; Nichols, 111; "Little v. Hazlett," 856-857; Crumrine, "Washington Borough," 489, 539; Boyd Crumrine, "Amwell Township," in *History of Washington County*, 656; Crumrine, *The Courts of Justice*, 72, 279-281; Beers, I:14-15, 104, 1070, 1453; Baird genealogy, Ancestry.com; McCulloch, 69, 176, 222.

Table 4: This is a list of colonizationists and radical abolitionists who were early purchasers of stock in the Franklin Bank of Washington. Shares cost \$50 each.

Colonizationists	Radical abolitionists
Reverend Matthew Brown, 20 shares	John S. Brady, 20 shares
Samuel Cunningham, 25 shares	William H. Cornwell, 5 shares
Reverend David Elliott, 12 shares	Joseph Henderson, 100 shares
Aaron Fenton, 10 shares	John Huston, 40 shares
William Hunter, 50 shares	F.J. LeMoyne, 120 shares
Isaac Leet, 100 shares	John McCoy, 25 shares
Thomas McCall, 80 shares	Joseph McDowell, 15 shares
T.M.T. McKennan, 35 shares	Samuel McFarland, 20 shares
Daniel Moore, 220 shares	Matthew McKeever, 20 shares
Samuel Murdoch, 20 shares	Thomas McKeever, 20 shares
Alexander Reed, 180 shares	Alexander Sweney, 10 shares
Robert R. Reed, 10 shares	Samuel Vance, 10 shares
Jacob Slagle, 25 shares	
William Smith, 100 shares	
George Wilson, 15 shares	

Source: Charter and list of subscribers, Franklin Bank of Washington, Pennsylvania State Archives, Record Group 26, Records of the Department of State.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- American Anti-Slavery Society. *Fourth Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society, with the Speeches Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting Held in the City of New York, on the 9th of May 1837, and the Minutes of the Meetings of the Society for Business*. New York: William S. Dorr, 1837. Samuel J. May Anti-Slavery Collection. Cornell University.
<http://ebooks.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=mayantislavery;idno=02817510>.
- . *The Anti-Slavery Record*. Vol. 2. New York: R.G. Williams, 1836. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/antislaveryreco02amer>.
- . *The Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society: With the Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention at Philadelphia, December 1833, and the Address to the Public, Issued by the Executive Committee of the Society, in September 1835*. New York: American Anti-Slavery Society, 1838. Internet Archive. <http://archive.org/stream/constitutionofam00amer#page/n1/mode/2up>.
- . *Third Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society; with the Speeches Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting, Held in the City of New York, on the 10th May 1836, and the Minutes of the Meetings of the Society for Business*. New York: William S. Dorr, 1836. Google Books. <https://books.google.com/books?id=NMLfAAAAMAAJ>.
- American Colonization Society. *A Few Facts Respecting the American Colonization Society and the Colony at Liberia*. Washington: D.C.: Way and Gideon, 1830. Internet Archive. <http://archive.org/stream/fewfactsrespecti01amer#page/n5/mode/2up>.
- . *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*. Vol. 10. Washington, D.C.: James C. Dunn, 1834. Google Books.
http://books.google.com/books/about/The_African_Repository_and_Colonial_Jour.html?id=RYsoAAAAYAAJ.
- . *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*. Vol. 14. Washington, D.C.: James C. Dunn, 1838. Google Books.
http://books.google.com/books/about/The_African_Repository.html?id=jx8SAAAAIAAJ.
- . *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*. Vol. 23. Washington, D.C.: C. Alexander, 1847. Google Books.
<http://books.google.com/books?id=zIkoAAAAYAAJ>.
- . *The Eleventh Annual Report of The American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: James C. Dunn, 1828. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/stream/annualreportame05socioog#page/n8/mode/2up>.

———. “The Tenth Annual Report of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour of the United States: With an Appendix.” In *Annual Report of the American Colonization Society, Vols. 6-10*. N.p, n.d, 1-101. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/annualreportofam927amer>.

Archives of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh, PA.

Archives of Washington and Jefferson College. Washington, PA.

Archives of Washington County Historical Society. Washington, PA.

“Baird against the Bank of Washington.” In *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*. Vol. 11, 3rd ed., 410-418. Philadelphia: Kay and Brother, 1876. Google Books. <http://books.google.com/books?id=9GAtAQAAAMAJ>.

Baird, Thomas H. *Memorial of Hon. Th. H. Baird Praying for the Enactment of Measures to Preserve the Constitution and Union of the States*. Pittsburgh: A.A. Anderson, 1864. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/memorialofhonthh00bair>.

“Barrington and Others against the Bank of Washington.” In *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*. Vol. 14, 3rd ed., 405-425. Philadelphia: Kay and Brother, 1874. Google Books. <http://books.google.com/books?id=GPrzAAAAMAJ>.

Beatty, Charles Clinton. *Lecture on the Formation of Female Character*. Steubenville, OH: Wilson and Harper, 1848. Google Books. <http://books.google.com/books?id=Lr5YAAAACAAJ>.

Brown, Matthew. *A Discourse Delivered at the Funeral of Alexander Reed, Esq., Washington Pennsylvania, September 11, 1842*. Pittsburgh: A. Jaynes, 1842.

Brownson, James I. “Biographical Sketch.” In *Memoriam of Rev. Charles Clinton Beatty, D.D., L.L.D., of Steubenville, Ohio, and of His Wife, Mrs. Hetty Elizabeth Beatty*, 7-65. New York: J.J. Little & Co. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/memoriamofrevcha00brow>.

———. “Historical Address.” In *Proceedings and Addresses at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of Washington College, Held at Washington, Pennsylvania, June 17th, 18th, and 19th, 1856*, 33-51. Pittsburgh: J.T. Shryock, 1857.

Clarke, James Freeman. *Anti-Slavery Days: A Sketch of the Struggle which Ended in the Abolition of Slavery in the United States*. New York: John W. Lovell Co., 1883. Google Books. http://books.google.com/books/about/Anti_slavery_Days.html?id=kBzVAAAAMAJ.

- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "An Act Authorizing the Governor to Incorporate the Wallenpaupack Improvement Co., and for Other Purposes." In *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1836-37*, 148-164.
- . "An Act to Incorporate the Franklin Bank of Washington." In *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1835-36*, 68-73.
- . "An Act to Incorporate the Monongahela Labor Academy." In *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1835-36*, 232-234.
- . "An Act to Incorporate the Washington and Pittsburg [sic] Railroad Co." In *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1836-37*, 137-148.
- . "An Act to Incorporate the Washington Female Seminary, in the Borough of Washington, in the County of Washington, and for Other Purposes." In *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1837-38, in the Sixty-Second Year of Independence*, 402-409. Harrisburg: Theo: Fenn, 1838.
- . *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1835-36, in the Sixtieth Year of Independence*. Harrisburg: Theo: Fenn, 1836.
- . *Laws of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Passed at the Session of 1836-37, in the Sixty-First Year of Independence*. Harrisburg: Theo: Fenn, 1837.

Daily Evening Reporter. Washington, PA.

Elliott, David. *An Inaugural Address Delivered November 2, 1830, by the Reverend David Elliott, A.M., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy and Political Literature and Acting Principal of Washington College, PA*. Washington, PA: John Grayson, 1830.

Gamble, Roxana Bentley. Untitled address. In Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 41-46.

Garrison, William Lloyd. *Thoughts on African Colonization: Or an Impartial Exhibition of the Doctrines, Principles and Purposes of the American Colonization Society, together with the Resolutions, Addresses and Remonstrances of the Free People of Color*. Boston: Garrison and Knapp, 1832. Google Books.
http://books.google.com/books/about/Thoughts_on_African_Colonization.html?id=nKFrso-yBjEC .

Grayson, Martha. "Tributary Offering." In Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 37-41.

Gregg, Mary Newton. "Reminiscences." In Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 21-23.

Gurley, R.R. *Mission to England, in Behalf of the American Colonization Society*. Washington, D.C.: William W. Morrison, 1841. Internet Archive.
<https://archive.org/stream/missiontoenglan00gurl#page/2/mode/2up>.

Haft, Mary J. Letter. In Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 18-20.

Hamilton, William. "Autobiography of William Hamilton." In *Transactions and Reports of the Nebraska State Historical Society*. Vol. 1, 60-75. Edited by Robert W. Furnas. Lincoln, NE: State Journal Co., 1885. Google Books.
<http://books.google.com/books?id=S5sUAAAYAAJ>.

Hays, George P. *History of the Second Presbyterian Church, Washington, Penn'a, as Delivered before the Congregation on Sabbath July 9, 1876*. Washington, PA: Swan & Ecker, Review and Examiner Office, n.d. Internet Archive.
<https://archive.org/details/historyofsecondp00hays>.

Kelley, James. Untitled remarks. In *Addresses on the Occasion of the Death of the Hon. Robert R. Reed, a Representative from the County of Washington, Delivered in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, January 4, 1865*, 5-14. Harrisburg: Singerly & Myers, State Printers, 1865. Internet Archive.
<https://archive.org/details/addressesonoccas00penn>.

LeMoyne, F.J., Lewis Tappan, Arthur Tappan, Thomas Ritter, William E. Whiting, Gerrit Smith, J. Heron Foster, R.C. Fleison, R. Hanna, Lucy Caroline, E. Goodman, Wm. Henry Brisbane, S.H. Chase, B.P. Aydelotte, W.A. Burleigh and Geo. Whipple. "Anti-Slavery Letters of Dr. F.J. LeMoyne of Washington, Pennsylvania." *Journal of Negro History* 18, no. 4 (October 1933): 451-474. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2714305>.

List of Sarah Hanna retirement event organizers. In Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 5-6.

"Little v. Hazlett." In *Atlantic Reporter* 47 (September 5, 1900-February 13, 1901): 855-860. Google Books. <http://books.google.com/books?id=DN4KAAAYAAJ>.

McConaughy, David. *Inaugural Address, Delivered May 9, 1832, by the Reverend David M'Conaughy, on His Induction to the Office of President of Washington College*. Washington, PA: John Grayson, 1832.

Meriden Anti-Slavery Society. *Apology for Abolitionists: Addressed by the Anti-Slavery Society of Meriden, Conn., to their Fellow-Citizens*. 2nd ed. Meriden: C.H. Pelton, 1837. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/apologyforabolit00anti>.

“Miller v. Dwilling.” In *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania*. Vol. 14. Edited by Thomas Sergeant and William Rawle Jr., 442-446. Philadelphia: McCarty and Davis, 1828. Internet Archive. <http://archive.org/stream/pennsupremecourt14penniala#page/446/mode/2up/search/dwilling>.

National Archives. Washington, D.C.

Nichols, Ella Campbell Slagle. *Family History*. N.p., n.d. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/familyrecord00nich>.

Niles, William Ogden, ed. *Niles' Weekly Register, Containing Political, Historical, Geographical, Scientifical, Statistical, Economical, and Biographical Documents, Essays and Facts: Together with Notices of the Arts and Manufactures and a Record of the Events of the Times*. Vol. 52. Baltimore: William Ogden Niles, 1837. Google Books. <https://books.google.com/books?id=zKM-AQAAMAAJ>.

Oberlin Anti-Slavery Society. *Constitution of the Oberlin Anti-Slavery Society*. Oberlin College, June 1835. <http://www.oberlin.edu/external/EOG/Documents/OberlinAntiSlaveryCon.htm>.

Our Country. Washington, PA.

Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society. *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Convention, Assembled to Organize a State Anti-Slavery Society, at Harrisburg, on the 31st of January and 1st, 2^d and 3^d of February 1837*. Philadelphia: Merrihew and Gunn, 1837. Internet Archive. <http://archive.org/stream/proceedingsofpen00penn#page/n5/mode/2up>.

Pennsylvania Colonization Society. Appendix. In *Address of Joseph R. Ingersoll at the Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, October 25, 1838*, 45-56. Philadelphia: William Stavely, 1838. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/addressofjosephr00inge>.

Pennsylvania State Archives. Harrisburg, PA.

Postscript. In David McConaughy, *Inaugural Address*, 17.

Reed, Alexander Preston. *Alexander Reed (1776-1842) and His Descendants*. Pittsburgh: Reed and Witting Co., 1960.

Reid, A.M. “Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Hetty Elizabeth Beatty.” In *Memoriam of Rev. Charles*

Clinton Beatty, D.D., L.L.D., of Steubenville, Ohio, and of His Wife, Mrs. Hetty Elizabeth Beatty, 109-148. . New York: J.J. Little & Co. Internet Archive.
<https://archive.org/details/memoriamefrevcha00brow>.

Seilhamer, G.O. *The Bard Family: A History and Genealogy of the Bards of "Carroll's Delight" together with a Chronicle of the Bards and Genealogies of the Bard Kinship*. Chambersburg, PA: Kittochtinny Press, 1908. Internet Archive.
<https://archive.org/stream/bardfamilyhistor00inseil#page/n9/mode/2up>.

The Friend of Man. Utica, NY: Cornell University. <http://fom.library.cornell.edu>.

The Pittsburgh Press. Pittsburgh, PA.

"Thomas H. Baird vs. The United States." In *Reports from the Court of Claims, Submitted to the House of Representatives, during the First Session of the Thirty-Fourth Congress: 1855-'56*. Vol. 1, 1-72. Washington: Cornelius Wendell, 1856. Google Books.
<http://books.google.com/books?id=hZQKAQAAMAAJ>.

"Trustees." In Washington Female Seminary, *Semi-Centennial Celebration*, 50.

U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census. *Heads of Families—First Census of the United States, 1790: State of Pennsylvania*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1908. Internet Archive.
<http://archive.org/stream/headsoffamiliesa08unit#page/n11/mode/2up>.

Washington and Jefferson College. *Biographical and Historical Catalogue of Washington and Jefferson College, Containing a General Catalogue of Washington College, of Jefferson College, and of Washington and Jefferson College, Including Thus All the Alumni of the Present College: 1802-1889*. Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Co., 1889. Internet Archive.
<http://archive.org/stream/biographicaland00eatogoog#page/n290/mode/2up>.

Washington Examiner. Washington, PA.

Washington Female Seminary. *Catalogue of the Officers and Pupils of the Washington Female Seminary, for the Academic Year, Commencing November 1853, and Ending September 1854, together with Conditions of Admittance, &c.* Washington, PA: Reporter Office, 1854. Internet Archive.
<http://archive.org/stream/catalogueofoffic00wash#page/16/mode/2up>.

———. *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion of the Graduates and Teachers of Washington Female Seminary in Honor of Mrs. Sarah R. Hanna, June 25, 1874*. Pittsburgh: Bakewell and Marthens, 1874. Historic Pittsburgh,
<http://digital.library.pitt.edu/cgi-bin/t/text/text-idx?c=pitttext;view=toc;idno=31735056286952>.

———. *Semi-Centennial Celebration of Washington Female Seminary*,

1836-1886, Washington, Penna., June 8, 1886, and General Catalogue of the Alumnae. Philadelphia: Thomson and Brother, 1886.

Washington Female Seminary Board of Trustees. Letter to Sarah R. Hanna. March 28, 1874. In Washington Female Seminary, *Commemorative and Farewell Reunion*, 3-4.

Washington Reporter. Washington, PA.

Welby, Adlard. *A Visit to North America and the English Settlements in Illinois, with a Winter Residence at Philadelphia: Solely to Ascertain the Actual Prospects of the Emigrating Agriculturist, Mechanic, and Commercial Speculator*. London: J. Drury, 1821. Internet Archive. <http://archive.org/details/visittonorthamer00welb>.

Wills, Charlotte LeMoyne. "History of the First Twenty-Five Years." In Washington Female Seminary, *Semi-Centennial Celebration*, 17-28.

Secondary Sources

"Seeking Contact wit [sic] the Descendants of Absalom Baird of Washington, PA."

Rootsweb, Last updated March 29, 1999.

<http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/BAIRD/1999-03/0922286236>.

Barker, Andrew S. "Chauncey Langdon Knapp and Political Abolitionism in Vermont, 1833-1841." *New England Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (September 2000): 434-462.

www.jstor.org/stable/366686.

Barnes, Gilbert Hobbs. *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844: The Story of the First American Revolution for Negro Rights*. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.

Bartlett, Irving H. "The Persistence of Wendell Phillips." In *The Antislavery Vanguard: New Essays on the Abolitionists*, edited by Martin Duberman, 102-122. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Beers, J.H. & Co. *Commemorative Biographical Record of Washington County, Pennsylvania, Containing Biographical Sketches of Prominent and Representative Citizens, and Many of the Early Settled Families*. Vol. 1. Chicago: J.H. Beers & Co., 1893.

Bell, Whitfield J., Jr., "Washington County, Pennsylvania, in the Eighteenth Century Antislavery Movement." *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 25, nos. 3-4 (September-December 1942): 135-142.

<http://ojs.libraries.psu.edu/index.php/wph/article/view/2233/2066>.

Berlin, Ira. *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South*. New York:

Vintage Books, 1976.

Berwanger, Eugene H. *The Frontier against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Biddle, Edward W. *Governor Joseph Ritner*. Carlisle, PA: Hamilton Library Association, 1919. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/governorjosephri00bidd>.

Birney, William. *James G. Birney and His Times: The Genesis of the Republican Party with Some Account of Abolitionist Movements in the South before 1828*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/jamesgbirneyhist00birn>.

Branton, Harriet K. "Sarah Foster Hanna and the Washington Female Seminary." In *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 61, no. 3 (July 1978): 221-231. <http://journals.psu.edu/index.php/wph/issue/view/361>.

Brewster, Robert Wallace. "The Rise of the Antislavery Movement in Southwestern Pennsylvania." *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 22, no. 1 (March 1939): 1-18. <http://ojs.libraries.psu.edu/index.php/wph/article/view/2108/1941>.

Brown, Isaac V. *Biography of Rev. Robert Finley, D.D., of Basking Ridge, N.J.: With an Account of His Agency as the Author of the American Colonization Society; Also, a Sketch of the Slave Trade; a View of our National Policy and that of Great Britain toward Liberia and Africa*. Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1857. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/stream/biographyrevrob00browgoog#page/n5/mode/2up>.

Burin, Eric. "Rethinking Northern White Support for the African Colonization Movement: The Pennsylvania Colonization Society as an Agent of Emancipation." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 127, no. 2 (April 2003): 197-229. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20093619>.

Chapman, John Jay. *William Lloyd Garrison*. 2nd ed. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1921. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/williamlloydgar02chapgoog>.

City of Meriden, Connecticut. *150 Years of Meriden: Published in Connection with the Observance of the City's Sesquicentennial, June 17-23, 1956*. Meriden: City of Meriden, 1956. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/150yearsofmeride00meri>.

Clark, Christopher. *Social Change in America: From the Revolution through the Civil War*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006.

Coleman, Helen Turnbull Waite. *Banners in the Wilderness: Early Years of Washington and Jefferson College*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1956. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/stream/bannersinthewild012852mbp>.

- Craven, Avery. *The Coming of the Civil War*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Creigh, Alfred. *History of Washington County from Its First Settlement to the Present Time*. Harrisburg: B. Singerly, 1871.
- Crumrine, Boyd. "Amwell Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 652-672.
- . "Buffalo Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 673-686.
- . "Canonsburg." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 601-627.
- . "Chartiers Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 707-721.
- . "Cross Creek Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 721-742.
- . "Donegal Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 742-764.
- . "Educational History." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 438-463.
- , ed. *History of Washington County, Pennsylvania, with Biographical Sketches of Many of Its Pioneers and Prominent Men*. Philadelphia: L.H. Everts & Co., 1882. Historic Pittsburgh, <http://digital.library.pitt.edu/cgi-bin/t/text/text-idx?idno=00hc17099m;view=toc;c=pitttext>.
- . "Hopewell Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 673-686.
- . "Internal Improvements." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 370-398.
- . "Maj. Samuel McFarland." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 564.
- . "Mount Pleasant Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 850-865.
- . "Nottingham Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 882-887.
- . "Smith Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 910-931.
- . "South Strabane Township." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 952-960.
- . "The Border Controversy between Pennsylvania and Virginia: 1748-1785." *Annals of the Carnegie Museum* 1, no. 4 (September 1902): 505-524. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/stream/cu31924017918735#page/n9/mode/2up>.
- . "The Civil and Legal History." In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 138-262.
- . *The County Court for the District of West Augusta, Virginia, Held at Augusta*

- Town, Near Washington, Pennsylvania, 1776-1777: With an Account of the County Courts for Ohio, Yohogania and Monongalia Counties, Virginia, Held 1777-1780.* Washington, PA: Washington County Historical Society, 1905. Mason and Dixon Line Preservation Partnership.
<http://www.mdlpp.org/pdf/library/1905AccountofVirginiaBoundaryContraversy.pdf>.
- . *The Courts of Justice Bench and Bar of Washington County, Pennsylvania: With Sketches of the Early Court-Houses, the Judicial System, the Law Judges, and the Roll of Attorneys of that County; and a History of the Erection and Dedication of the Court-House of 1900.* Chicago: The Lakeside Press, R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1902. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/courtsofjusticeb00crum>.
- . “Washington Borough.” In Creigh, *History of Washington County*, 476-564.
- Curtis, George Munson. “Meriden’s Early History.” In *A Century of Meriden, “The Silver City”: An Historic Record and Pictorial Description of the Town of Meriden, Connecticut, and Men Who Have Made It*, edited by C. Bancroft Gillespie, Part I, 5-434. Meriden: Journal Publishing Co., 1906. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/historicrecordpi00gill>.
- De Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Edited by Harvey C. Manfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Dillon, Merton L. “The Abolitionists: A Decade of Historiography.” *Journal of Southern History* 35, no. 4 (November 1969): 500-522. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2206837>.
- Finkelman, Paul. “The Kidnapping of John Davis and the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793.” *Journal of Southern History* 56, no. 3 (August 1990): 397-422.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2210284>.
- Foner, Eric. *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010.
- Forrest, Earle L. *History of Washington County*. Vol. 1. Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1926.
- Fox, Early Lee. *The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1919. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/americancoloniza00foxe>.
- Garrison, Wendell Phillips and Francis Jackson Garrison. *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879: The Story of His Life Told by His Children*. Vol. 1. New York: The Century Co., 1885. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/williamlloydgarr00garr>.
- Grimsted, David. *American Mobbing, 1821-1861: Toward Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Hellegers, John F. “Some Bases of Early Pro-Jackson Sentiment in Western Pennsylvania.”

- Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 45, no. 1 (March 1962): 31-46.
<http://journals.psu.edu/wph/article/view/1917>.
- Huston, James L. "The Experiential Basis of the Northern Antislavery Impulse." *Journal of Southern History* 56, no. 4 (November 1990): 609-640.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2210930>.
- Jeffrey, Julie Roy. *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Kocher, Kurt Lee. "A Duty to America and Africa: A History of the Independent African Colonization Movement in Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania History* 51, no. 2 (April 1984): 118-153. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27772966>.
- Lamoreaux, Naomi R. "Banks, Kinship and Economic Development: The New England Case." *Journal of Economic History* 46, no. 3 (September 1986): 647-667.
www.jstor.org/stable/2121478.
- Litwack, Leon F. *North of Slavery: The Negro in the Free States, 1790-1860*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. Ebrary e-book.
- Magdol, Edward. *The Antislavery Rank and File: A Social Profile of the Abolitionists' Constituency*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Mainwaring, W. Thomas. *Abandoned Tracks: The Underground Railroad in Washington County Pennsylvania*. Forthcoming.
- McConnell, W.A. "The United Presbyterian Congregation of Mount Pleasant." In Boyd Crumrine, *History of Washington County*, 862-864.
- McCulloch, Margaret C. *Fearless Advocate of the Right: The Life of Francis Julius LeMoyne, M.D., 1798-1879*. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1941.
- McFarland, Joseph F. *20th Century History of the City of Washington and Washington County, Pennsylvania, and Representative Citizens*. Vol 1. Chicago: Richmond-Arnold Publishing, 1916. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/stream/20thcenturyhisto01mcfa>.
- McLoughlin, William G. "Introduction to the Harbinger Edition." In Gilbert Hobbs Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse*, vii-xxxi.
- Melder, Keith E. "Woman's High Calling: The Teaching Profession in America, 1830-1860." *American Studies* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1972): 19-32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40641074>.
- Morris, Christopher. *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County, and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770-1860*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press, 1999.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/duquesne/docDetail.action?docID=10317727>.

- Myers, John L. "The Early Antislavery Agency System in Pennsylvania, 1833-1837." *Pennsylvania History* 31, no. 1 (January 1964): 62-86.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27770233>.
- Potter, David M. *The Impending Crisis: America before the Civil War, 1848-1861*. 1976. Reprint, New York: Harper Perennial, 2011.
- Presbytery of Washington, PA. *History of the Presbytery of Washington, Including a Brief Account of the Planting of the Presbyterian Church in Western Pennsylvania and Parts Adjacent, with Sketches of the Pioneer Ministers and Ruling Elders: Also Sketches of Later Ministers and Ruling Elders*. Philadelphia: James B. Rodgers Printing Co., 1889. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/historyofpresbyt00pres>.
- Richards, Leonard L. *Gentlemen of Property and Standing: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Scott, Anne Firor. "What, Then, is the American: This New Woman?" *Journal of American History* 65, no. 3 (December 1978): 679-703. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1901418>.
- Searight, Thomas B. *The Old Pike: A History of the National Road with Incidents, Accidents, and Anecdotes Thereon*. Uniontown, PA: Published by the author, 1894. Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/details/oldpikeahistory00seargoo>.
- Sernett, Milton C. *North Star Country: Upstate New York and the Crusade for African American Freedom*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2002.
- Slaughter, Thomas P. *The Whiskey Rebellion: Frontier Epilogue to the American Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Smith, David G. "On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870." Doctoral diss., Penn State University, 2006.
<https://etda.libraries.psu/paper/7274/2633>.
- Staudenraus, P.J. *The African Colonization Movement, 1816-1865*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Sweet, Leonard I. "The Female Seminary Movement and Woman's Mission in Antebellum America." *Church History* 54, no. 1 (March 1985): 41-55.
<http://www.jstor.com/stable/3165749>.
- Tomek, Beverly C. *Colonization and its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania*. New York: New York University Press, 2011.
- University of Virginia. Historical Census Browser. <http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/php>.
- Venet, Wendy Hamand. *Neither Ballots Nor Bullets: Women Abolitionists and the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991. Google Books.

<http://www.google.com/search?tbo=p&tbm=bks&q=isbn:081391342X>.

Walters, Ronald G. *American Reformers, 1815-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.

———. *The Antislavery Appeal: American Abolitionism after 1830*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978.

Warner, Beers & Co. *History of Cumberland and Adams Counties, Pennsylvania: Containing History of the Counties, their Townships, Towns, Villages, Churches, Industries, Etc.; Portraits of Early Settlers and Prominent Men; Biographies; History of Pennsylvania, Statistical and Miscellaneous Matter, Etc., Etc.* Chicago: Warner, Beers & Co., 1886. Google Books.

http://books.google.com/books?id=pcwwAQAAMAAJ&source=gbs_navlinks_s.

Watson, Harry L. *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America*. 2nd ed. New York: Hill and Wang, 2006.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War against Slavery*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

Ziegler, J. L. *An Authentic History of Donegal Presbyterian Church Located in East Donegal Township, Lancaster County, Pa.* Philadelphia: F. McManus Jr. and Co., 1902. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/authentichistory00zieg>.